

CHAPTER—14

Leave of Absence to Members

When members are elected or nominated, they are expected to take their seats in the Rajya Sabha and attend its proceedings unless they are constrained to remain absent due to unavoidable reasons.

Constitutional and legal provision

The Constitution of India provides that if for a period of sixty days a member of either House of Parliament is without permission of the House absent from all meetings thereof, the House may declare his seat vacant.¹ In computing the said period of sixty days, however, no account is taken of any period during which the House is prorogued or is adjourned for more than four consecutive days.²

The period of sixty days referred to in the Constitution means a single unbroken period of sixty days and for invoking the provision of the Constitution, the absence has to be continuous. The period of absence is calculated from the day a member is absent from the sitting of the House till the day he next attends, whether in the same or subsequent session(s). The intervening days in session on which the House does not sit are counted but any period of prorogation or adjournment of the House for more than four consecutive days is excluded.

The constitutional provision is only directory and not mandatory; being an enabling power, it is within the competence of the House to condone the absence of a member exceeding a period of sixty days.³

Apart from aforementioned provision enshrined in the Constitution, rule 214 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha also deals with the procedures relating to leave of absence of members from meetings of Council.

Attendance Register

In view of the specific provision that has been made in the Constitution, it has become necessary to maintain a Register of Attendance of members. Such a Register is maintained by the Secretariat to enable members to record their attendance. Before entering the House, a member has to record his presence by signing the Register every day. For the

convenience of members the Attendance Register is split into four parts containing the Division Numbers, namely: (1) Division Nos. 1 to 61; (2) Division Nos. 62 to 127; Division Nos. 128 to 195; and (4) Division Nos. 196 to 250. Each part is kept on a separate rostrum in the Inner Lobby of the House. Members are informed of this arrangement through a paragraph in the Parliamentary Bulletin Part-II issued at the commencement of every session.⁴ The Register remains on the rostrum throughout the sitting of the House. After the adjournment of the House each day, all the four parts are collected and on the basis of the same, the attendance of members is marked with 'P' in a Consolidated Attendance Register kept in the Lobby Office. When a member informs in writing that he forgot to sign the Attendance Register on any particular day although he was present in the House, his statement in original is tagged with the corresponding attendance sheet without marking his presence in the Register. This gives a complete record of the attendance of members and helps to compute the period of continuous absence of members. The attendance of members is also reflected in the Rajya Sabha website.

The Attendance Register which was originally introduced as an informal and convenient arrangement for marking attendance of members is now a statutory requirement with effect from 9 June 1993. A new proviso added to section 3 of the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament Act, 1954, which reads as follows:

Provided that no member shall be entitled to the aforesaid allowance (*i.e.*, D.A.) unless he signs the register, maintained for this purpose by the Secretariat of the House of the People or the Council of States, as the case may be, on all the days (except intervening holidays for which no such signing is required) of the session of the House for which the allowance is claimed.

Payment of daily allowance to a member is, therefore, dependent upon his signing the Register.⁵ In view of the express provision made in the Act, a practice has been introduced to furnish daily record of the attendance of members to the Pay and Accounts Office and Members' Salaries and Allowances Branch of the Secretariat to enable them to clear members' daily allowance claims.⁶

The Register is also utilised for reminding a member about the constitutional provision in respect of attendance of members. As soon as a member completes forty days of continuous absence without permission of the House, the Secretariat informs him about it so that he may apply for leave of absence in time. A reminder is sent to him when his continuous absence comes to fifty days. If a member is continuously absent from the sittings of the House for sixty days or more, without permission, his attention

is drawn to the constitutional provision and the relevant rules and he is advised to apply for leave of absence for the period, stating the reasons necessitating his absence.

Procedure for obtaining leave of absence

A member wishing to obtain permission of the House for remaining absent from meetings thereof under clause (4) of article 101 of the Constitution is required to make an application stating the period for which he may be permitted to be absent from the meetings of the House.⁷ The member is required specifically to ask for leave. No action is taken on a communication of a member which merely intimates that he will not attend the session but does not ask for leave.⁸

An application for leave of absence is required to be made in writing addressed to the Chairman of the Rajya Sabha. It is necessary that the application should be made and signed by the member himself and it should be addressed to the Chairman. However, on occasions, leave of absence has been granted on the basis of a telegram⁹ or cable.¹⁰

Sometimes the leave application has also been entertained when the member has addressed it to the Secretary-General instead of the Chairman.¹¹ If a member is unable to apply for leave of absence himself in writing for reasons of health and another member has applied on his behalf, such an application has also been entertained and leave granted to the member on that basis.¹² In a case, however, where an adviser of a member who was unwell requested for leave of absence on behalf of the member, the adviser concerned was informed that the leave application should be sent under the member's own signature, which he did.¹³

A letter, dated the 29 July 2010, was received from Shri Sitaram Yechury, Leader of the CPI (M) Party in the Rajya Sabha, stating that Shri P.R. Rajan, MP, was admitted in ICU in a Hospital at Ernakulam, Kerala, due to serious neurological problem and sought leave of absence from the House for Shri P.R. Rajan. It was decided that since the letter is from the Leader of the Party and the member for whom leave is applied for is also from the same Party, and in view of the serious nature of illness, leave of absence was granted to Shri P.R. Rajan for the 220th Session.¹⁴

The period for which leave of absence is required by a member must not exceed sixty days in view of the constitutional provision. Strictly speaking, under the constitutional provision, it is not necessary to take the permission of the House for leave to remain absent for less than sixty days but to be on the safer side members apply for leave of absence without waiting for completion of the maximum period of absence of sixty days. The Rules Committee considered but did not agree to a suggestion that

rule 214 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, which deals with the leave of absence, should be amended to specifically provide that an application for leave of absence should not at any time exceed sixty days.¹⁵ Generally, therefore, requests for leave of absence have been granted for specific periods such as the beginning or end of a month in a year¹⁶ or after a particular date during the session¹⁷ or for a number of sittings or weeks or days¹⁸ or a part of session¹⁹ or retrospectively for absence during previous sessions.²⁰

The current practice is that generally leave is granted for the entire session. Only in case where leave asked for is for a period exceeding ten days in a session, the leave application is placed before the House. Leave application for a period of less than ten days is not placed before the House.²¹ In case a member asks for leave of absence for a part of the session, it is not put to the House if the member has already attended the session for a day or days²² or his absence is not going to reach the total of sixty or more days. In case the leave of absence is asked for a part of the session, sometimes the application is kept pending and put to the House only when the member does not attend after the specified period.²³ If a member asks for conditional leave *i.e.* leave in case he is not able to attend by a particular date during the session, the application is kept pending until he attends by the date specified or a further communication is received from him and if he fails to attend, his leave application is placed before the House towards the end of the session for grant of leave.²⁴

Ordinarily, while applying for leave, members mention the grounds on which leave is asked for. The following are some of the grounds on which members have asked for leave of absence:

- i. illness of self;
- ii. illness, accident, mishap, death, marriage in the family or performance of obsequies, etc.;
- iii. visits abroad for professional work or participation in conferences or UNO/UNESCO meetings as a delegate, for study or to fulfil family obligations, etc.;
- iv. pre-occupation with professional work as a doctor, artist, etc.;
- v. arrest/detention;

On a point of order whether leave of absence should be granted to members going to jail, the Chairman ruled in the affirmative observing: "If they are unable to attend whatever be the reason."²⁵ During the Emergency, leave of absence was granted to a number of members on

account of their detention. A member in detention was granted leave of absence “on account of his non-transfer to Tihar Jail, Delhi to attend the session”.²⁶

Shrimati Kanimozhi, MP who was in the judicial custody, was granted leave of absence for the entire 223rd Session of the Rajya Sabha. As she continued to be in the judicial custody, the question arose whether she could be granted leave of absence for the entire 224th Session of the Rajya Sabha treating her previous request as an open-ended letter. It was decided that another letter may be sought from her for grant of leave of absence for the 224th Session of the Rajya Sabha. However, she was granted bail by the Delhi High Court and she attended the sitting of the Rajya Sabha on 8 December 2011.²⁷

- vi. to attend to private affairs or personal work;²⁸
- vii. pre-occupation with some problems;²⁹
- viii. heavy engagements in public affairs, such as attending meetings of local council, conference, committee, etc.;³⁰
- ix. important or urgent work;³¹
- x. domestic emergency;³²
- xi. unavoidable or compelling reasons or circumstances;³³
- xii. disturbed situation or famine condition in the member’s place necessitating his presence there;³⁴
- xiii. presence in connection with election petition/writ petition;³⁵
- xiv. inability to attend;³⁶

On an occasion, when a point was raised whether the reasons should be specified by the member in the application for seeking the leave of absence, the Chair, while ruling it out, observed that he had read out the application, as received, to the House.³⁷ When a member requested for leave of absence from his home town, without specifying any reasons, the Chairman read out the application to the House upon which leave was granted but he observed that the ground was not sufficient. The observations of the Chairman were conveyed to the member concerned.³⁸

xv. Participation in Games and Sports.

A letter dated 7 March 2013, received from Shri Sachin Tendulkar stating that he would be unable to attend the sittings of the Rajya Sabha from 21 February to 7 March 2013, due to participation in the cricket test matches against Australia at that time. Since leave of absence to members of the Lok Sabha was granted on the ground of

participation in Games and Sports (as per the recommendations of the Lok Sabha Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of the House) leave of absence was granted to Shri Sachin Tendulkar.³⁹

Disposal of leave applications

After the receipt of an application, the Chairman, as soon as may be, reads out the application to the House. Till the shifting of the Question Hour from 11.00 a.m.-12.00 noon to 12.00 noon-01.00 p.m. in November 2014, this used to be done after Question Hour and laying of papers on the Table, if any. Ever since, any application for leave of absence is generally read out to the House after oath/affirmation, obituaries, references and laying of papers, if any. However, on one occasion which was the last day of the session, leave of absence was granted to a member at 9.05 p.m.⁴⁰ After communicating the application, the Chairman asks, "Is it the pleasure of the House that permission be granted to such and such member for remaining absent from all meetings of the House for such and such a period". If no one dissents, the Chairman says, "Permission to remain absent is granted". But if any dissenting voice is heard, the Chairman takes the sense of the House and thereupon declares its determination. No discussion is permitted on any question before the House in this regard. After a decision has been signified by the House, a communication is sent to the member informing him of the grant or refusal, as the case may be, of leave of absence.⁴¹

It will thus be seen that the rule requires the Chairman to read out the leave application to the House. This enables the House to know the facts of the case before indicating its pleasure in the matter. The Rules Committee considered but did not agree to a suggestion that instead of the Chairman reading out the application, he should put the question before the House and ascertain its pleasure to grant the request.⁴² In the matter of grant of leave to a member there is no motion before the House and there is no question in the sense understood in respect of motions and resolutions. The Chairman, therefore, ascertains the pleasure of the House on a leave application without putting any formal question before the House.⁴³

However, on an occasion when the Chairman informed the House that he had received a letter from a member for grant of leave of absence because he had "to look over the organisational work as well as fund collection to make the Sarvodaya Sammelan a success which is going to be held at Raipur in this month where all the top leaders are expected to participate", a member raised a point of order whether it was a proper reason for being absent from the session of the House. The Chairman stated that he was just informing the House about the receipt of the letter and would be guided by the vote of the House.

The Chairman thereafter proposed a question: "that leave be granted to Shri L.N. Das for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the current session". The motion was adopted.⁴⁴

The current practice in regard to reading out the leave application to the House is that the Chairman informs the House of the substance of the ground for asking leave rather than reading out the whole of the leave application.⁴⁵ By this, unnecessary details are omitted or long leave applications are abridged and the matter is restricted to only material and relevant details contained in the leave application.

On 28 November 2002, when the leave application of Ms. Lata Mangeshkar was placed before the House for grant of leave of absence for the 197th Session of the Rajya Sabha, the Deputy Chairman observed, "We have to either give the permission or not to give the permission. It has to be done...Now, I really do not know, Should I have a voting? The main thing is, if one is a member of this House, he should come, at least, occasionally. It is not correct to be a member of this august body and just neglect the responsibility of coming to the House. I can understand that one may be ill for some time but one cannot be ill for a couple of years. Thereafter, one member requested the Chair that though permission may be granted, but the feeling of the House that the member should come may also be conveyed. The Deputy Chairman then observed, "Permission to remain absent is granted. But, it will also be conveyed to the member that she should come to the House, at least, occasionally".⁴⁶ The member was communicated accordingly.⁴⁷

So far as ascertaining the pleasure of the House is concerned, in the context of granting leave to a member, the Deputy Chairman observed on 31 July 1995, "I think we have to change the word 'pleasure'. The Secretary-General may take note that for such a permission, we need not use the word 'pleasure'..."⁴⁸ Accordingly, the current practice is that the Presiding Officer asks the House, "does he/she have the permission of the House for remaining absent", etc.⁴⁹

Non-granting of leave of absence

There has been only a solitary case so far when leave of absence was not granted to a member of the Rajya Sabha. At the sitting of the Rajya Sabha on 22 March 1976, the Chairman informed the House that the following letter dated 1 March 1976 had been received from Shri Subramanian Swamy, M.P.

I have been informed that the next session of the Rajya Sabha is commencing on 8 March 1976. As I am still on my tour abroad, and will not be able to return during the expected length of the session,

I request you to grant me leave of absence from this imminent session of the House.

Thereafter, the Chairman asked for the pleasure of the House for grant of permission to the member for remaining absent from all meetings of the House during the 95th Session of the Rajya Sabha. While some members said, “No”; some others said, “Yes”. With a view to deciding the case, as per the procedure, he took the sense of the House. On finding that some members were in favour of and some other members were against granting the leave, he declared: “The sense of the House is that leave should not be granted. Permission to remain absent is not granted.” This, as the Chairman observed in reply to a query, “had happened for the first time in the Rajya Sabha.”⁵⁰

Vacation of seat on account of absence

The seat of a member who has remained absent for sixty days or more from the sittings of the House and who has not been granted leave of absence by the House, shall be declared vacant on a motion by the Leader of the House or by such other member to whom he may delegate his functions in this behalf. If the motion is carried, the Secretary-General shall cause the information to be published in the Gazette and forward a copy of the notification to the Election Commission for taking steps to fill the vacancy thus caused.⁵¹

So far there has been only one case of vacation of seat on account of absence in the Rajya Sabha. In the case of the member in respect of whom the Rajya Sabha adopted the motion on 21 December 2000, declaring his seat vacant, the attention of the member was drawn to the provision of clause (4) of article 101 of the Constitution when his absence from the meetings of the House came to 42 days and again when the absence came to 51 days and finally when his total absence up to 190th Session of the Rajya Sabha amounted to 58 days. After his total absence crossed 60 days and when there was no response from the member, a note was sent to the Leader of the House for his information. Thereafter, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Information Technology gave a notice of his intention to move the motion. Accordingly, an item in this regard was listed in the revised list of business for 21 December 2000.

On 21 December 2000, Shri Pramod Mahajan, Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Information Technology moved the following motion in the Rajya Sabha:

“That in pursuance of clause (4) of article 101 of the Constitution of India, the seat of Shri Barjinder Singh Hamdard, member of Rajya Sabha who has been absent from all meetings of the House for a period of more than sixty days is hereby declared vacant.”⁵²

Consequent upon the adoption of the above motion, the fact that the seat of the member was declared vacant in terms of article 101(4) of the Constitution was notified in the Gazette of India.

A member does not automatically vacate his seat in the House by absence for any length of time. But if he remains absent for a continuous period of sixty days (excluding periods of prorogation or adjournment over four days consecutively), the House may declare his seat vacant by a motion. It is not obligatory upon the House to pass such a motion. While the circumstances mentioned in clause (3) of article 101 automatically cause a vacancy, the absence under article 101(4) causes a vacancy only if the House considers it fit to unseat the member and declare the seat vacant.⁵³

A member was granted leave of absence by the House on 5 May 1987, for remaining absent during the 142nd Session of the Rajya Sabha. When his total absence up to the 144th Session amounted to fifty-four days, a letter was sent to him drawing his attention to the constitutional provision contained in article 101(4) and he was advised to apply for leave of absence. There was no response from him. His total absence upto the next session came to eighty days. No communication was received from him. A note was, therefore, sent to the Leader of the House for his information and such action as he deemed necessary in the matter. A communication was also sent to the Leader of the Party (CPM) to which that member belonged. The Leader of the House informally suggested that the member concerned be asked to explain as to why proceedings under article 101(4) of the Constitution be not initiated for his prolonged absence without permission of the House and while doing so he be requested to state the reasons for not attending the session since July 1986 and also the circumstances under which he could not apply for leave of absence. The Leader of the Party also informally stated that he had no objection to initiate action. However, nothing was heard from the member.⁵⁴ Information was received that the member was murdered on 13 January 1989.⁵⁵

Absence of Deputy Chairman, Leader of the House and Ministers

Whenever the Deputy Chairman is unable to attend the sittings of the House during a session he intimates the Chairman accordingly. This enables making necessary arrangements to preside over the sitting of the House by a member of the panel of Vice-Chairmen in the absence of the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman.

On an occasion, the Leader of the House was granted leave of absence on health ground. Upon a member saying, "He does not need our leave", the Deputy Chairman observed, "He has written a letter."⁵⁶

Ministers do not apply for permission of the House for their absence from the sittings thereof due to their duties outside Delhi or any other reason. However, as a matter of courtesy to the House, whenever Ministers have to remain absent for long periods during the session or go on a visit abroad, they inform the Chairman accordingly.

Ministers also inform the Chairman of their absence from the sittings even for a short period and intimate the arrangements made by them regarding the handling of parliamentary business standing in their names during their absence.

Leave of absence to a member appointed as Chief Minister

A member who had been appointed as Chief Minister but had not resigned his seat in the Rajya Sabha applied for leave of absence without specifically mentioning any reasons in the application. Although, there was no bar to entertain the application, there was no precedent in the matter and the application was kept pending.⁵⁷

Leave of absence to a member who has not made and subscribed oath/affirmation

A member who has not made and subscribed the oath or affirmation can ask for leave of absence in order to avoid penalty envisaged in the Constitution.

Dr. Zakir Husain, whose term of office as a nominated member commenced on 3 April 1952, was granted leave of absence on 14 July 1952; he took oath on 11 August 1952, during the first session of the Rajya Sabha which had commenced on 13 May 1952.⁵⁸

The term of office of Shri Lal K. Advani and Shri Sunder Singh Bhandari commenced on 3 April 1976. They took oath on 28 February 1977. In between the period they were granted leave of absence.⁵⁹ After leave of absence was granted to Shri Bhandari on 18 May 1976, a member suggested that if there was no difficulty, either the Deputy Chairman or a Vice-Chairman could visit the jail and administer oath to a member in detention. The Chairman observed: "There appears to be a precedent in such a case where we have given leave to remain absent. But what you have suggested will be looked into."⁶⁰

Shri R.K. Karanjia who was nominated to the Rajya Sabha on 11 January 1991, was granted leave of absence on 22 February 1991 during the 157th Session of the Rajya Sabha; he made affirmation on 11 July 1991. When a point was raised about Shri Karanjia asking for leave of absence without making oath or subscribing affirmation, the Deputy Chairman ruled that the member was entitled to ask for leave of absence even though he had not taken oath.⁶¹

Similarly, Ms. Lata Mangeshkar who was nominated to the Rajya Sabha on 22 November 1999, was granted leave of absence on 6 December 1999 during the 188th Session of the Rajya Sabha; she took oath on 23 February 2000.

Leave of absence to a member whose resignation is under consideration

Some members had not been attending the House as their resignations from the membership of the House were pending consideration of the Chairman. It was felt that in view of their resignations which were under the consideration of the Chairman, it was not necessary to write to members inviting their attention to their absence which had come to about forty days or more.⁶²

Revocation of granted leave of absence

A member was granted leave of absence from all the meetings of the House during a session. He, however, attended the sittings during the currency of the session and in a letter requested that the leave of absence granted to him be revoked. There was no provision or precedent for such revocation and the view held was that there was no restriction on a member to attend the session during the days for which he was granted leave of absence. The question of revoking the leave did not arise.⁶³ However, if a member who has been granted leave of absence attends the sessions of the House during the period for which the leave of absence has been granted to him, the unexpired portion of the leave from the date of his resumed attendance stands lapsed.

Payment of daily allowance during leave of absence

A member who is granted leave of absence by the House under article 101(4) of the Constitution is not entitled to daily allowance for the period of such leave of absence even if during this period he resides at the place of the session of Parliament. This also flows from the requirement of the proviso to section 3 of the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament Act, 1954 as for claiming daily allowance a member has to sign the Attendance Register.⁶⁴

Supply of information regarding attendance of members

Information regarding attendance of a member on particular days is supplied to the member on his request. While making such a request the member has to specify the purpose for which the information is required. When such a request is granted, information is supplied from the Attendance Register only about the days on which the member has actually signed the Register.

Supply of information from Attendance Register to Court of law

All records relating to the attendance of members are in the custody of the Secretary-General and the same may be supplied to a court of law only with the permission of the House, if it is in session or of the Chairman, if the House is not in session.⁶⁵

A request was received from the sessions judge, Cuddalore, for certified extracts from the Attendance Register from 1 March 1963 to 15 March 1963 in the Rajya Sabha, showing the presence and attendance of Shri R. Gopalakrishnan, member of the Rajya Sabha. As the House was not in session when the said request was received, the Chairman granted permission to send the relevant extracts from the Attendance Register, duly certified, to the sessions judge. The extracts were sent on 30 January 1964 and the Deputy Chairman informed the House accordingly.⁶⁶

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Art. 101(4).
2. *Ibid.*, Proviso.
3. Kaul and Shakhder, *Practice and Procedure of Parliament*, 6th Edn., 2009, p. 405.
4. See for instance Bn. (II), 18.11.1991.
5. Bn. (II), 10.8.1993.
6. F. No. 5/2/93-L.O.
7. R. 214(1).
8. F. Nos. 1/4/84-L.O. and 1/4/89-L.O.
9. C.S. Deb., 26.8.1953, c. 296; 8.3.1954, c. 1996-97; R.S. Deb., 4.9.1961, c. 2912-13; 15.12.1972, c. 113; 31.7.1975, c. 4-5; 6.12.1978, c. 146; 22.12.1992, c. 296; and 14.2.1995, c. 263.
10. *Ibid.*, 15.5.1953, c. 5993; 8.3.1954, c. 1996; R.S. Deb., 2.8.1994, c. 393; 17.8.1994, c. 272-73; and 14.2.1995, c. 263.
11. F. No. 1/4/91-L.O.
12. R.S. Deb., 1.12.1983, c. 225-27. In this case, however, the Chairman had also received a telegram from the ailing member.
13. F. No. 1/4/91-L.O.
14. R.S. Deb., 5.8.2010, c. 234-35.
15. 3 Rpt., COR mts., 5.8.1981.
16. C.S. Deb., 27.5.1952, c. 460-61; and 15.5.1953, c. 5993.
17. *Ibid.*, 19.12.1952, c. 2450-51.
18. *Ibid.*, 2.3.1953, c. 1426; R.S. Deb., 10.8.1966, c. 2137-38; 12.7.1979, c. 155; 18.8.1972, c. 142; and 21.8.1972, c. 126.
19. *Ibid.*, 11.8.1952, c. 3731-32; 4.12.1952, c. 905-06; 19.12.1952, c. 2450-51; 2.3.1953, c. 1426; 16.4.1953, c. 3064; R.S. Deb., 19.3.1955, c. 2437; 5.4.1955, c. 3998; 3.9.1958, c. 1918-19; 28.3.1961, c. 123; 2.9.1965, c. 2481-82; and 17.8.1966, c. 2876.
20. *Ibid.*, 25.11.1953, c. 321-22; R.S. Deb., 14.9.1957, c. 5663-64; and 23.4.1958, c. 178-79.
21. F. No. 1(4)/1992-L.O.
22. F. Nos. 1/4/89-L.O. and 1/4/92-L.O.
23. F. No. 1/4/84-L.O.

24. F. No. 1/4/89-L.O.
25. R.S. Deb., 11.12.1962, c. 3734; and 26.3.1965, c. 4685-86.
26. *Ibid.*, 16.9.1991, c. 10.
27. F. No. 1(4)/2010-L.O.
28. C.S. Deb., 16.4.1953, c. 3063-64; and R.S. Deb. 14.12.1961, c. 2390-91.
29. *Ibid.*, 24.11.1953, c. 177.
30. R.S. Deb., 3.9.1954, c. 1241; 29.5.1957, c. 1018; 31.5.1957, c. 2546; and 15.6.1967, c. 4072-73.
31. *Ibid.*, 23.12.1954, c. 3196; 15.3.1955, c. 1954-55; 21.12.1956, c. 3351; 20.8.1956, c. 1652; and 23.11.1972, c. 210.
32. *Ibid.*, 7.6.1967, c. 2660-61.
33. *Ibid.*, 14.9.1957, c. 5663-64; 9.1.1976, c. 86-87; 15.1.1976, c. 257-58; and 12.3.1976, c. 128.
34. *Ibid.*, 17.9.1958, c. 3629; 21.8.1972, c. 126; and 18.8.1980, c. 230.
35. *Ibid.*, 7.12.1960, c. 1136-37; 18.12.1964, c. 4367; 24.2.1965, c. 938; 13.5.1965, c. 1887; and 19.12.1973, c. 219.
36. *Ibid.*, 31.3.1965, c. 5185; and 21.3.1967, c. 316-17.
37. *Ibid.*, 26.5.1971, c. 137-41.
38. *Ibid.*, 5.5.1987, c. 182-83; and F. No. 1/4/87-L.O.
39. F. No. 2(2)/2013-L.O.
40. R.S. Deb., 27.8.1993, c. 624.
41. R. 214.
42. 3 Rpt., COR mts., 5.8.1981.
43. Rpt., COR Memorandum No. 32 of 1980.
44. R.S. Deb., 17.12.1963, c. 3749-50.
45. F. No. 1/4/84-L.O. For past instance see R.S. Deb., 21.11.1969, c. 902; 28.4.1970, c. 142-43; 7.1.1976, c. 133-34; 22.1.1976, c. 131-32; 9.3.1976, c. 126; 24.3.1976, c. 125; 25.3.1976, c. 116-17; 30.11.1977, c. 138; 19.7.1978, c. 213-14; 25.4.1979, c. 113; 18.8.1980, c. 230; and 25.7.1984, c. 204.
46. R.S. Deb., 28.11.2002, c. 203-04.
47. F. No. 1(4)/2001-L.O.
48. R.S. Deb., 31.7.1995, c. 189-90
49. F. No. 1/4/95-L.O.; R.S. Deb., 4.8.1995; and 26.8.1995.
50. R.S. Deb., 22.3.1976, c. 78-80.
51. R. 215.
52. Bn. (I), 21.12.2000.
53. D.D. Basu, *Commentary on the Constitution of India*, 5th Edn., Vol. 2, p. 564.
54. F. No. 10/88-T.
55. R.S. Deb., 21.2.1989, c. 35 containing obituary reference in respect of Shri T.S. Gurung.
56. C.S. Deb., 24.11.1952, c. 36-37.
57. F. No.1/4/83-L.O.
58. C.S. Deb., 14.7.1952, c. 993.
59. R.S. Deb., 18.5.1976, c. 81-82; 24.8.1976, c. 104; and 12.11.1976, c. 2.
60. *Ibid.*, 18.5.1976, c. 81-82.
61. *Ibid.*, 22.2.1991, c. 166-67.
62. F. No. 1/4/83-L.O.
63. F. No. 1/4/82-L.O.
64. F. No. 1/4/90-L.O. and 1/12/93 L.O.
65. 1 Rpt., COP.
66. R.S. Deb., 11.2.1964, c. 101.