

Date	Session	Text of the Ruling
SEVENTH ASSEMBLY		
15/12/2023	4 th Session (Part-IV)	<p>The Chair gave a Ruling on the financial autonomy of Delhi Vidhan Sabha and hurdles being created by the Finance Department, GNCTD in its financial affairs :-</p> <p>I would like to draw your attention to an important issue in which an attempt is being made to violate the independent functioning of the Legislative Assembly Secretariat, at the center of which is the Finance Department of the Delhi Government.</p> <p>It has been clearly defined in the Indian Constitution that the establishment of a Secretariat along with financial independence for the Parliament and State Legislative Assemblies will be ensured, whose powers will be vested in the Speaker. However, it is extremely unfortunate that despite completion of 30 years of formation of Delhi Legislative Assembly, it has to depend on the Finance Department to meet its financial requirements. Further, now the irony is that the Finance Department is making an unconstitutional attempt to neutralize the powers given to the Secretary, Legislative Assembly.</p> <p>In this context, I had given a ruling in this House on 27.03.2023, on which the then Finance Minister, Shri Kailash Gehlot had issued instructions vide letter dated 28.03.2023 that the letter dated 22.03.2023 should be considered as withdrawn. However, I regret to inform that despite the clear instructions of the Hon'ble Minister, the Finance Department has not yet withdrawn the above mentioned letter dated 22.03.2023. Efforts are being made continuously by the Finance Department to sideline the existence of the Secretary, Legislative Assembly and take over the functioning of the Legislative Assembly through the Secretary (Law).</p> <p>In the Finance Department's letter dated 22.03.2023, it has been shown that the work of the Secretary, Legislative Assembly/Head of the Department will be performed by the Secretary (Law), whereas in various references of the Law Department, it is clearly specified that in the context of the Legislative Assembly, the work of the Law Department is limited to Legislative Affairs, which includes finalizing the bills to be presented in the Legislative Assembly and work related to summoning/prorogation sessions of Assembly. It has also been clarified by the Law Department that the works related to financial and administrative matters of Legislative Assembly will be performed by Secretary, Legislative Assembly only and there will be no interference from the Secretary (Law) in these matters.</p> <p>In this context, Principal Secretary (Law) has informed vide letter dated July 28, 2023, that till a decision is taken regarding any change in the already existing traditions or precedents in the</p>

		<p>functioning of the Legislative Assembly Secretariat, the Secretary, Legislative Assembly will exercise the powers of the Administrative Secretary and Head of the Department. It is also necessary to mention here that in 1995, the Ministry of Home Affairs had created the post of Secretary for Delhi Legislative Assembly and since then the post of Secretary, Legislative Assembly is being extended by the Finance Department which is currently effective till 2028.</p> <p>On the above subject, a meeting was organized by the Finance Department in the office of the Finance Minister, Smt. Atishi on 17.11.2023, in which it was informed that in a Memorandum issued by the Hon'ble Lt. Governor in 2009, it is specified that the Secretary (Law) will be the Head of the Department for Law, Justice and Legislative Affairs. However, there is no mention about the administrative and financial matters of Delhi Legislative Assembly being governed by the Law Department in this letter.</p> <p>It is extremely surprising that Principal Secretary (Finance) is not able to differentiate between matters relating to Legislative Affairs and Administrative & Financial matters. It is unjustified stubbornness on his part to impose restrictions on the powers of Secretary, legislative Assembly.</p> <p>Thereafter, giving due respect to the Memorandum issued by Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor in 2009, the Legislative Assembly started sending all the files to the Secretary (Law) for financial and administrative approval and thus a total of 45 files were sent to Secretary (Law) for approval of the Finance Department. All these files were received back in the Legislative Assembly Secretariat on December 04, 2023 with the approval of the Hon'ble Minister (Law) with the instructions that the Legislative Assembly should work as per its existing system and thus it was ensured that the work of the Head of Department and Secretary, Legislative Assembly would be continued to be performed by the Secretary, Legislative Assembly.</p> <p>Subsequently, for a definite decision regarding this arrangement, I have sent my note dated 05 December 2023 to the Chief Secretary with the request that he should inform all the concerned departments about the involvement of the Finance Department only in legislative matters because Additional Secretary (Law), with prior approval of Principal Secretary (Law), has vide his letter dated 01 December 2023 again clarified that the files of administrative and finance related works of the Legislative Assembly Secretariat should not be sent to the Law Department and should be disposed as per the settled practice of past years . Thereafter, I have directed the Secretary, Legislative Assembly, to continue working as the Head of the Department and Administrative Secretary in the Delhi Legislative Assembly, as has been done since 1993.</p> <p>I have also directed the Secretary, Legislative Assembly, that until an appropriate decision is taken on this subject, he should continue to work as the Head of the Department and</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Administrative Secretary in the Delhi Legislative Assembly, as has been done since 1993.</p> <p>I would request the Secretary, Legislative Assembly to distribute a copy of this arrangement along with necessary documents to all the Hon'ble Members.</p> <p>Thereafter, Chair also placed a proposal before the House to send a copy of the Ruling to Chief Secretary, Delhi for information and compliance.</p> <p>The House unanimously passed the proposal by voice vote.</p>
--	--	--

18/12/2023	4 th Session (Part-IV)	<p>The Chair gave a Ruling regarding delay in granting approval by Principal Secretary (Finance), GNCTD to the files of Delhi Legislative Assembly related to e-Vidhan Sabha project and other expenditure proposals :-</p> <p>During the proceedings of the House on 15 December 2023, Shri Madan Lal, Hon'ble Member while discussing the pressing issue of environmental protection had drawn the attention to the bundle of documents in the House and stated that in order make Delhi Legislative Assembly function as an e-Vidhan Sabha, a provision of Rs 20 crore was made in the budget in the year 2019-20 and even after so much time has elapsed, the e-Vidhan Sabha project is yet to be completed. The Hon'ble Member also stated that if e-Vidhan Sabha had been functioning, the unnecessary use of papers could have been avoided and as a measure of environmental protection, many trees could have been saved from being cut.</p> <p>Hon'ble Members, I had also given information regarding this on 15 December 2023 but at that time the related data was not available with me. But today, with great distress, I am informing that the e-Vidhan Sabha file was sent to the Principal Secretary (Finance) on 10 April 2023 for engaging a Consultant and after that reminders were also sent several times and the Principal Secretary (Finance) was also informed. I also want to inform the House that the tender process for this work has already been initiated and tenders have also been opened but due to the delay in getting approval from the Finance Department, the cost of e-Vidhan Sabha project is escalating, Will the Principal Secretary (Finance) take responsibility for escalated costs. Due to his obstinacy, the file related to engagement of Consultant for e-Vidhan Sabha project has not been approved till date though eight months have since passed.</p> <p>I also want to inform the House that the Legislative Assembly Secretariat is being continuously harassed for its day-today expenditure. The canteen bills of the Legislative Assembly are pending with the Principal Secretary (Finance) for last one and a half years. I am attaching copies of the pending files. I have also sent information regarding this to the Hon'ble Lt. Governor on 24 November 2023.</p> <p>Principal Secretary (Finance) is not approving these files. This reflects his malicious attitude. It is a matter of concern that on whose instructions is the bureaucracy indulging in such undesirable behaviour. It is also a matter of regret that this year the programs on the occasion of Diwali, Chhath festival, Gurupurab and now Christmas and New Year could not be organized because the Finance Department did not approve the files related to these programs. These events are organized every year not only to promote social, religious and cultural harmony but also to make the general public aware of rich values and traditions of Indian culture.</p> <p>I am placing this entire issue on the table of the House for appropriate action.</p> <p>The House unanimously passed the Motion by voice vote.</p>
------------	-----------------------------------	--

17.04.2023	4th session (Part –II)	<p>Hon'ble Members, the Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor has written a note to the Hon'ble Chief Minister regarding the convening of this session. A copy of the note has been endorsed to the Assembly Secretary also. Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor is of the opinion that the convening of the Second Part of the Fourth Session today is not in accordance with the Cabinet Decision No.3115 dated 14.04.2023 and inconsistent with the statutory provisions of the National Capital Territory of Delhi, Act. In this connection I would like to inform the Hon'ble Members that on Saturday 15.04.2023, the Assembly Secretariat received the Cabinet Decision No. 3115 dated 14.04.2023 recommending a one day session for today i.e. 17.04.2023 through the Law Department which is the normal practice. As there was no recommendation for prorogation of the Fourth Session which was adjourned sine die on 29.03.2023, the Hon'ble Speaker convened the Second Part of the Fourth Session under Rule 17(2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Delhi Assembly. Summons was issued to the Hon'ble Members accordingly. Under Rule 17 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Delhi Assembly, the Hon'ble Speaker has the power to call a sitting of the House "at any time after the House has been adjourned sine-die". However as per prevailing parliamentary practice the Speaker convenes only on the recommendation of the Cabinet. This is the practice in all legislatures including the Lok Sabha. Rule 15 of the Lok Sabha Rules of Procedure confer similar powers on the Lok Sabha Speaker. In Ramdas Athawale v. Union of India matter the Hon'ble Supreme Court upheld the validity of the proceedings of the Second Part of the session which was reconvened on 29 January 2004. In fact, Shri Vijender Gupta, Hon'ble Member had also challenged the part session of our Assembly in the Hon'ble High Court and got no relief. The Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor has also observed that there is no indication of any legislative business proposed to be transacted during the session as per Rule 15(1) of the Rules of Procedure of Delhi Assembly. Rule 15 (1) clearly states that it is the Speaker who shall decide the business of the House in consultation with the Hon'ble Chief Minister. The Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor has no role in these matters. It is also not necessary to have legislative business in all sittings. The House has been convened many times in the past too to discuss urgent issues which affect the people of Delhi. I am surprised that in spite of clear cut statutory provisions and judgements of the Hon'ble Courts why the Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor is indulging in such practices which doesn't behave his constitutional post. The Lieutenant Governor and his Office should realise that they do not enjoy any immunity. The LG is not a Governor. This particular note also was first shared with the media even before we could receive it. I am referring this matter to the Committee of Privileges. The Committee should examine and report whether there has been any breach of privilege and contempt and also whether the Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor can be summoned before the Committee or not.</p>
------------	---------------------------	---

29.03.2023	4th session	The Chair gave a Ruling regarding presence of Officers and furnishing of information to Assembly and its Committees and stated that any defiance of the Directions/Ruling would be referred to Committee of Privileges. The Chair also directed that a copy of the Directions/Ruling be sent to Chief Secretary, Delhi.
21.03.2023	4th session	The Chair gave a Ruling on the Notice of Breach of Privilege against Shri Kailash Gahlot and Shri Gopal Rail, Hon'ble Ministers given by Shri Vijender Gupta, Hon'ble Member and informed the House that it was received at 10:59 AM, whereas per Rules it should be submitted at least 03 (three) hours before the commencement of sitting on that day. He stated that the Notice mentioned leak of contents of Outcome Budget, already presented on 20/03/2023, and did not relate to the Annual Budget. He also stated that it was obvious that sole motive of Shri Vijender Gupta, Hon'ble Member was to disrupt the proceedings of the House and waste precious time of the House. The Chair also warned Shri Vijender Gupta, Hon'ble Member to be careful in future and not waste the time of the House by such frivolous Notice which was also against the Rules.
20.03.2023	4th session	The Chair informed the House that on 18th January, 2023, Members of Opposition had displayed water bottles in the House allegedly containing polluted water from Yamuna River. He had announced that these bottles would be sent to Delhi Jal Board (DJB) for testing. He informed that reports dated 07/03/2023 and 15/03/2023 had been received from DJB wherein it has been clearly said that the water in the bottles is not from Yamuna River but was drinking water in which some black substance was mixed. The Chair termed this incident as serious in which deliberate attempt was made to create panic and unrest among the people of Delhi and also mislead the House. The Chair referred the matter to the Committee of Privileges to submit a comprehensive report on the conduct of Members of Opposition Party who displayed the water bottles on 18/01/2023 in the House which was against the Rules. The Chair also referred to the Committee of Privileges, to report whether there was an attempt on the part of DJB officers to suppress and delay the Report. The Chair directed the Committee of Privileges to submit its Report, on the above twin matters, with in one month. The Chair directed that the Reports of DJB be circulated to the Hon'ble Members in the House for information.

27.03.2023	3rd session	<p>Hon'ble Members. I wish to draw your attention to an important crisis forced upon the Assembly Secretariat. The constitution provides that the Parliament and State Legislature should have an independent secretariat and financial autonomy under the control of the Speaker.</p> <p>Unfortunately, despite the lapse of 30 years since the Delhi Assembly was created, the Delhi Assembly Secretariat still depends on the Finance Department for its expenditure. The Assembly Secretary functions as its Administrative Secretary and Head of Department and has been delegated certain financial powers. However, there is now an attempt to curtail even these limited powers.</p> <p>The Finance Department has unilaterally declared that the Law Secretary will be the Administrative Secretary and HOD for Delhi Assembly. This is in spite of the Law Department repeatedly and categorically stating that they are not and cannot be the Administrative Department of the Assembly.</p> <p>This is a direct attack on the Legislature and a blatant attempt to curtail its independent functioning.</p> <p>This is against the decision of this House which had accepted the recommendation of the GPC for an independent secretariat on 27.02.2019. This is also a direct defiance of the Hon'ble Dy Chief Minister's directions to the Finance Secretary on 12.12.2017. Most importantly, the Secretary-General Lok Sabha had conveyed to the Delhi Chief Secretary vide his letter dated 31.12.2021 regarding the recommendation of the All India Presiding Officers conference for the grant of financial autonomy to Delhi Assembly in open defiance of all these developments and Law Department's opinion, the Finance Department has attempted to hamper the working Delhi Assembly Secretariat which directly affects Assembly and its Committees. I fail to understand why the Principal Secretary (Finance) is hell bent on creating hurdles in the working of the Delhi Assembly. I smell a conspiracy by these officers motivated by political considerations. I had called a meeting on 02.08.2022 with the Principal Secretary (Finance) and the Principal Secretary (Law). The Principal Secretary (Finance) failed to attend the meeting. However, Shri Kulanand Joshi, Special Secretary (Finance & Services) assured that all necessary steps would be taken to resolve the issue.</p> <p>In my view this is a matter of breach of privilege and contempt of the Assembly.</p> <p>I am told that once Ch. Prem Singh former speaker refused to sign the budget as officers had been transferred out of the assembly without his approval. The Chief Secretary had to meet the Speaker and withdraw the transfer order. But, I realise such steps would cause hardships to the</p>
------------	-------------	--

		<p>public. After all this is public money and I firmly believe that the constitutional authorities should always keep public interest as their topmost priority.</p> <p>However, before the Assembly takes any action. I request the Hon'ble Minister of Finance to direct that the Finance Department letter dated 22.03.2023 be immediately withdrawn and the Steps being taken to implement the recommendation of the GPC and All India Presiding Officers Conference. He should also inform the House the circumstances and persons responsible for this illegal and unconstitutional attempt to obstruct the working of the Delhi Assembly.</p> <p>I request the Secretary (LA) to circulate a copy of this ruling and the relevant papers with the Hon'ble Members.</p>
18.01.2023	3rd session (part-IV)	The Chair directed that the samples of water bottles displayed be sent to Laboratory for quality testing to ascertain the veracity of claims made by Members of Opposition Party.

05.07.2022	3rd session (part-II)	The Chair made a brief statement on the issue and constituted a “House Committee on the non-receipt of replies from Services Department” and nominated the following Members to the Committee with the directions to submit a report within 48 hours :
24.03.2022	3rd session	The Chair directed that Starred Question No. 10 will be listed again on 28th March, 2022 for reply.
03.01.2022	2nd session (part-IV)	The Chair expressed serious displeasure on the issue and referred the matter of non-receipt of reply of Starred Question No. 01 to Committee of Privileges. He reiterated his earlier directions that all such questions which were not being answered on the directions of Hon’ble Speaker would stand referred to the Committee of Privileges.
03.01.2022	2nd session (part-IV)	The House agreed to constitute a House Committee to recommend measures for the Welfare of Cows and other related issues. The Chair directed that the report of the Committee should be submitted within one month.
29.07.2021	2nd session (part-II)	The Chair took cognizance of the fact that the officers in the Officers Gallery did not stand up during National Song ‘Vande Mataram’ as a gesture of respect and directed that the matter be brought to the notice of Chief Secretary, Delhi for necessary action.
29.07.2021	2nd session (part-II)	The Chair gave a ruling that the Members of Opposition will be allowed floor time in proportion to their party strength in the House as was being done in the Lok Sabha

SIXTH ASSEMBLY

03.12.2019	8th session (part-III)	Starred questions No. 22, 24 & 25 were asked and replied. Hon’ble Members were not satisfied with the reply of Starred Question No. 25. Taking into account the sense of the House, the Chair directed that the Commissioners of all Municipal Corporations to be present in the House at 5.00 PM.
25.02.2019	8th session	The Chair stated that replies to certain Questions had not been received from some Departments inspite of the directions of the Hon’ble Ministers. He reiterated that these stand referred to the Privileges Committees. The Chair further stated that Hon’ble Minister of Law had also informed that the Revenue Department had refused to submit information regarding some Questions. He stated that the power to admit or disallow a Question lies with the Speaker alone. He also directed the Committee of Privileges to examine these issues on priority.
21.12.2018	7th session (part-V)	Sh. Jagdish Pradhan, Shri Vijender Gupta, Hon’ble Leader of Opposition and other Members of BJP sought to raise the issue of funds to the Municipal Corporations of Delhi and the issue of Finance Commissions. Others Members also demanded that the issue should be discussed in detail and the Government should submit Action Taken Report on the Finance Commissions Reports. Taking the sense of the House, the Chair directed the Govt. to submit the Action Taken Report on Finance Commissions Reports and also announced that the House shall sit on 03 January, 2019 to discuss it.

07.08.2018	7th session (part-III)	The Chair directed that the Hon'ble Members should adhere to the provisions of the Rules regarding admissibility of questions so that they are not disallowed. He asked them to ensure that the questions pertain to a single subject of one department and that they are not excessively lengthy. He also informed that if necessary, the Assembly Secretariat would edit the questions so that they confirm to the Rules.
07.08.2018	7th session (part-III)	The Chair directed that the matter of non-receipt of replies to Starred & Unstarred Questions listed for 07 August 2018 pertaining to Urban Development Department stood referred to the Committee of Privileges as per his earlier directions. He also asked the Minister of Urban Development to provide his comments in writing about his discussions with the concerned officers regarding these questions by 10 August 2018.
06.06.2018	7th session (part-II)	The Chair directed that keeping in view the concerns of the Hon'ble Members and sense of the House, the Starred Questions 14 & 16 pertaining to Revenue Department and Starred Question 19 pertaining to Education Department be listed for 07 June, 2018. Replies of Unstarred Questions of Education Department (U/S 04, 09 & 10), Revenue Department (U/S 31) had also not been received. Hence, replies to these questions alongwith the personal explanation of the concerned Secretary/Principal Secretary should be submitted through the concerned Minister's by 2.00 PM on 07 June, 2018. The Chair further directed that the Administrative Secretary/Principal Secretaries of Revenue and Education Departments should be present in the Officer's Gallery at 2.00 PM on 07 June, 2018
07.06.2018	7th session (part-II)	Taking the sense of the House, Hon'ble Speaker extended the sitting of the Second Part of the Seventh Session of Sixth Delhi Legislative Assembly upto 11th June 2018. He directed that these three starred questions were again being listed for answer on 11th June, 2018 and also directed that complete replies to the questions should be provided by the concerned Secretaries to the Ministers. He also directed that the concerned Secretaries should be present on 11th June, 2018. Starred Questions No. 21 & 22 were asked and replied to. Replies to Starred Questions No.23 to 40 and Un-Starred Questions No. 38 to 110 (except unstarred Question No. 46, 70, 78, 80 & 89) were placed on the table
08.06.2018	7th session (part-II)	The Chair directed that keeping in view the concerns of the Hon'ble Members and sense of the House, I hereby direct that Starred Question No. 44 pertaining to Services Department and Starred Question No. 54 pertaining to Land and Building Department be listed for 11th June, 2018. Reply of Unstarred Question No. 120 of Services Department has also not been received. Replies to all these questions should be submitted through the concerned Minister. Further, the Administrative

		Secretary/ Principal Secretaries of Services Department and Land and Building Department should be present in the Officer's Gallery at 2.00 PM on Monday, 11th June, 2018.
11.06.2018	7th session (part-II)	Reply to Unstarred Question No. 120 (Services Department) was also not received. The Chair referred the aforesaid questions to the Privileges Committee and also directed that all the other questions which had not been replied by the various departments, stand referred to the Privileges Committee. He also directed that the Committee should submit its report before the commencement of next session or one month, whichever is earlier.
09.04.2018	7th session	The Chair directed that the Principal Secretary (Urban Development), Commissioners' (NDMC/SDMC/EDMC) and Chief Executive Officer, Delhi Jal Board be present in the Officers' Gallery on 10 April 2018 at 2.00 PM and 4.30 PM respectively when the matters concerning their departments are taken up in the House.
06.04.2018	7th session	Shri Om Prakash Sharma, Shri Praveen Kumar and Shri Vishesh Ravi also expressed their views on the matter raised by Shri Vijender Garg pertaining to 'Utilisation of MLALAD Funds in MCD Parks' under Rule-280. They demanded that the aforesaid issue be discussed in the House. The Chair agreed and directed that the Principal Secretary (Urban Development), Commissioners' (NDMC/SDMC/EDMC) be present in the Officers' Gallery on 09 April 2018 at 3.00 PM when the matter would be taken up in the House.
06.04.2018	7th session	Shri Vijender Gupta, Hon'ble Leader of Opposition raised objection on the discussion on the Outcome Report of Office of Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor. He stated that the Report should be sent to the Hon'ble Lt. Governor and also demanded that his reply be tabled in the House. The Chair gave the following Ruling: "Hon'ble Members, I have received today i.e. 06 April 2018 a letter dated 05 April 2018 of the Hon'ble Leader of Opposition and other Members of the BJP in which they have raised objections over discussion on the Outcome Report on the Office of Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor. Surprisingly, I read about the letter in the newspapers such as The Pioneer, Hindustan, Hari Bhoomi and Vir Arjun before it actually reached me. In this connection, I wish to inform the Members that submission of a report on administrative matters is the prerogative of the Government. It is not a personal report on the Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor. It is simply a report to bring out the facts on the proposals sent to the Office of the Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor. There was neither any interpretation nor allegation contained in it. The constitutional provision of the post of Lieutenant Governor is different from the other states. The Hon'ble Lieutenant. Governor has been provided executive powers in Delhi and as per established principles, the executive is responsible to the Legislature. The budget to the executive is allotted after approval of the Assembly. As per Rule291 of Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business, if any doubt arises as to

		interpretation of any of the provisions of these rules, the decision of the Speaker shall be final and Rule-293 states that no decision of the Speaker in respect of allowing or disallowing of any resolution or question or in respect of any other matter, shall be questioned. I request the Members of BJP that they should not politicise the aforesaid issue and should try to understand the facts given in the Outcome Report instead of putting unnecessary efforts for publicity in Media.”
27.03.2018	7th session	The Chair referred the reply to Starred Question No. 131 (Transport Department) to the Questions & Reference Committee as some Members were not satisfied with the reply submitted by the department concerned.
27.03.2018	7th session	The Chair referred the reply to Starred Question No. 124 (PWD Department) to the Committee on Estimates as some Members were not satisfied with the reply submitted by the department concerned.
26.03.2018	7th session	The Chair referred the reply to Starred Question No. 102 (Urban Development) to the Questions & Reference Committee as some Members were not satisfied with the reply submitted by the department concerned.
26.03.2018	7th session	The Chair gave a ruling on Starred Question No. 102 and informed the Hon’ble Members that the Principal Secretary (Law) has forwarded a copy of letter dated 19 March 2018 of Joint Secretary to the Lieutenant Governor regarding admissibility of questions on so called ‘reserved’ subjects. The letter has communicated an advice received from the Department of Legal Affairs, Government of India through the Ministry of Home Affairs. It states, inter alia, that “in view of the provision contained in Article 239AA (3) and (4) read with Rule 29 of the Procedure and Conduct of Business of the Legislative Assembly of National Capital Territory of Delhi, legally the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly cannot admit any Question on any Reserved Subject.” As informed by the Hon’ble Deputy Chief Minister on 19 March 2018, the Vigilance Department Officers refused to provide proper reply to Starred Questions 04 and 16 on these same grounds. I have already referred the issue to the Committee of Privileges and also directed the Chief Secretary to ensure that the replies are submitted immediately. The Secretariat has received copies of letters from some Departments such as Services, Vigilance, Land & Building refusing to attend briefing meetings with the concerned Ministers. I fail to understand the reason for these childish attempts to challenge the privileges of this Assembly. As pointed out by the Deputy Chief Minister in the House, this information cannot be denied even under the RTI Act. Thus information which an ordinary citizen is entitled to have, is being denied to this privileged House. Questions related to the reserved subjects have been asked and answered in this House since its inception. Trying to evade questions on vigilance matters under the garb of ‘services’ smacks of intent to protect the corrupt.

		<p>Rule 29 states that “A question must relate to a matter of administration for which the Government is responsible. Its purpose shall be to elicit information or to give suggestion of action on a matter of public importance.” First of all it should be noted that as per Rule-291 the Speaker’s decision is final regarding interpretation of the Rules of Procedure. Moreover, Rule-293 clearly states that “No decision of the Speaker in respect of allowing or disallowing of any resolution or question or in respect of any other matter, shall be questioned.”</p> <p>There is a provision similar to Rule-29 in the Lok Sabha Rules. Rule-41 (2) (viii) of the Lok Sabha Rules, the Question “shall not relate to a matter which is not primarily the concern of the Government of India”. But such questions are admitted on the discretion of the Hon’ble Speaker. I would like to quote from Kaul and Shakhdar’s Practice and Procedure of Parliament – “The discretion to allow a question which is not the primary concern of the Government of India is exercised by Speaker on the merits of each case. In such matters, the extent of public importance is the deciding factor.” The officers should realise that legislation on reserved subjects and seeking replies on matters of public interest which directly affect the people of Delhi are two different issues. Hence I direct that the officers are duty bound to provide replies to all questions which are admitted. Any attempt from anyone, whatsoever post he may hold, to deny information to the Assembly and its Committees shall be viewed seriously. I reiterate that all the questions, replies to which have not been received.</p>
20.03.2018	7th session	The Chair referred the replies to Starred Question No. 26 (DUSIB), 27 & 31 (Food & Supply Department) to the Questions & Reference Committee as some Members were not satisfied with the reply submitted by the departments concerned.
19.03.2018	7th session	Hon’ble Deputy Chief Minister informed that Replies to Starred Questions 04 and 16 pertaining to Vigilance Department could not be answered as, in spite of his written directions, the officers had informed him that the Legislative Assembly could not ask questions on ‘reserved subjects’. He also alleged that the action of the officers was contempt of all the legislatures in the country. Shri Somnath Bharti, Shri Saurabh Bharadwaj, Shri Pankaj Pushkar, Shri Akhilesh Pati Tripathi and Shri Mohinder Goyal expressed their views on the subject. The Chair stated that he was referring the issue of non-submission of replies by the Officers to the Committee of Privileges. He also directed the Chief Secretary to immediately ensure that the replies were submitted to the House.
19.03.2018	7th session	Starred Question No. 05 to 08 were asked and replied. Shri Gulab Singh stated that he was not satisfied with the reply of starred Question No. 08, as the Department had denied knowledge of a press interview of Smt. Manisha Saxena alleging assault of teachers and Principal. He sought to know the details of the interview of the officer which appeared in ‘Dainik Jagaran’ newspaper of 05

		March 2018. The Chair directed the Hon'ble Deputy Chief Minister to furnish the complete details on 20 March 2018 after the House had taken up Special Mention (Rule 280). He also directed that Smt. Manisha Saxena, Divisional Commissioner should be present in the Officers Gallery when the matter is taken up
16.03.2018	7th session	On the objection of the opposition members regarding Shri Kailash Gahlot continuing as Minister in spite of being disqualified, the Chair ruled that as per Constitutional provisions read with the Section 43(2) of the GNCTD Act, 1991, Shri Kailash Gahlot could continue up to six months as Minister without being a Member of the House. He informed the Members that the Hon'ble Supreme Court had also upheld this position and hence there was no grounds to prevent Shri Kailash Gahlot continuing as a Minister.
16.01.2018	6th session (part-II)	Taking the sense of the House, the Chair referred the issues relating to sealing of commercial establishments by the MCDs, collection and utilisation of conversion charges and other related matters to the House Committee on Municipal Corporations of Delhi chaired by Ms. Bhawna Gaur. He also directed that all the Municipal Commissioners should depose before the Committee as and when required by the Committee and state the facts. The Committee was directed to submit its report on the first day of the next Session.
11.10.2017	6th session	The Chair clarified and directed that all the Committees of the House shall continue to function as per the existing provisions of the Rules of Procedure and the Message of Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor shall not have any effect on the functioning of these Committees.
30.06.2017	5th session (part-IV)	Ms. Alka Lamba stated that Shri Manjinder Singh Sirsa had made statements to the Media and on social media on 29.6.2017 claiming that the Ruling Party members had sought a referendum on Kashmir. Shri Jarnail Singh, Shri Akhilesh Pati Tripathi, Shri Avtar Singh 'Kalkaji', Shri Somnath Bharti and Shri Saurabh Bharadwaj also spoke on the issue. Shri Avtar Singh 'Kalkaji' proposed that the matter be referred to the Committee of Privileges. Shri Manjinder Singh Sirsa also presented his version. The Chair taking the sense of the House, referred the matter to the Committee of Privileges.
29.06.2017	5th session (part-IV)	The Chair informed the House that his attention had been invited by Members towards the fact that a lady had unauthorisedly entered the MLA Lounge and abused Hon'ble Members. She had also tried to enter the visitors' gallery without proper authorization. The Chair stated that the lady had reportedly entered the Assembly again on 29.06.2017. The Chair also informed that the entry on 28.06.2017 had been facilitated by the Office of the Leader of Opposition and the entry on 29.06.2017 had been facilitated by Shri Kapil Mishra. The Chair took the sense of the House and referred the matter to the Committee of Privileges.

28.06.2017	5th session (part-IV)	The Chair directed the Ministers to ensure the presence of the concerned Pr. Secretary/Secretary/Head of Deptt. and the Chief Secretary in the officers gallery when issues related to their Departments were taken up for discussion in the House.
28.06.2017	5th session (part-IV)	The Chair directed the Hon'ble Members to recommend the names of persons for visitors' gallery only if they were personally assured about the visitors' antecedents. He also directed that applications for passes should not be entertained unless they bear the signature & stamp of the MLAs and enclosed with copies of photo I. Cards of the visitors duly attested by MLA. He also directed that telephonic requests for issue of passes will not be accepted.
18.01.2017	4th session (part-VI)	The Chair stated that he had received a complaint from Shri Vijender Garg, Hon'ble Member regarding non-receipt of reply to Starred Question 04 listed for 17.01.2017 on time. He also informed that replies to unstarred questions 02, 03 & 04 pertaining to Health Department had also not been received within the stipulated time. The Chair also stated that even for the questions listed for 18.01.2017, the Secretariat had not received replies in time. He directed that the Chief Secretary, Delhi should take note of this fact and direct all concerned officers to ensure that the replies to Assembly Questions reach within the stipulated time.
17.01.2017	4th session (part-VI)	Shri Vijender Gupta, Hon'ble Leader of Opposition raised a point of order that the reconvening of the session was illegal as it was mandatory for a new session in a calendar year to begin with the address of the Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor. The Chair gave his ruling that the convening of the session was in accordance with Rule 17 of the Rules of Procedure, past practices in other legislatures including Lok Sabha and decision of the Constitution Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The Chair also warned Hon'ble Leader of Opposition against dragging Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor into avoidable controversies
09.09.2016	4th session (part-III)	The Chair stated that the House was about to discuss the issue of the attempts to derail the independence of the legislature and informed the House about the attempt to unconstitutionally transfer the Assembly Secretary without his approval and made a statement on the issue. Chair also directed that his letter dated 30.8.2016 addressed to the Hon'ble Lieutenant Governor be taken on record of the House proceedings immediately after the conclusion of his observation.
09.09.2016	4th session (part-III)	The Chair informed the House that he had received a letter from the Leader of Opposition seeking discussion on an issue without quoting any Rule under which he proposed to raise the issue. He expressed his concern over the fact that the letter of the Leader of Opposition was received by him after it had appeared in the media. He stated that it appeared that the Leader of Opposition was not serious and was more interested in seeking publicity than actually raising the issue. He also stated that earlier in the day the Leader of Opposition gave a notice of Calling Attention under Rule

		54. He stated that as a Calling Attention and two Short Duration Discussions were already listed for the day, hence using his powers he would be allowing a discussion on the notice of the Leader of Opposition after completion of the listed business for the day.
03.12.2015	2nd session	Sh. Anil Kumar Bajpai raised an issue of pending dues owed by Ex MLAs towards DUSIB on account of letting out premises to NGOs. The Chair directed the Minister to enquire into such matters
26.11.2015	2nd session	The Chair directed that the replies to Starred questions no. 81 to 100 and to un-starred questions no. 55 to 81 be placed on the table
24.11.2015	2nd session	Hon'ble Speaker expressed concern that most of the replies to the Questions listed for the day pertaining to the Minister of Social Welfare and Delhi Jal Board had not been received so far. The Chair directed the Departments concerned to submit the reply of Questions well in time and stated that the officers concerned should strictly look into the matter to ensure that the replies should reach within stipulated time. The House agreed to the Chair's statement that the officers responsible for the inordinate delay in supply of replies to the questions should be brought before the House Committee. The matter stands referred to the Committee on Privileges.
03.08.2015	1st session (part-V)	Hon'ble Speaker observed that the concern raised by Hon'ble Members during the course of the debate about inaction on the part of Police on complaints filed by women Members of the House are very serious. He directed the Secretariat to examine if that negligence on the part of Police amounts to breach of privilege. He also took the sense of the House to proceed in the matter, if necessary.
27.05.2015	1st session (part-III)	The Chair stated that two separate Notices of Calling Attention have been received from Sh. Vijender Gupta, Leader of Opposition and Sh. Om Prakash Sharma in which they have called the attention towards the situation arising out of frequent power cuts and acute scarcity of water in East & North-East Delhi and in Night Shelters of Delhi. The Chair Ruled that as per the Rule-54(1) of Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business, the Notice of Calling Attention should reach in the Assembly Secretariat three hours before the commencement of the sitting whereas the Notices from Hon'ble Members were received at 12:05 P.M.. & 12:30 P.M.. respectively. Hence the Chair disallowed the Notice of Calling Attention. Hon'ble Speaker stated that a Notice of Censure Motion under Rule-114 has also been received from Sh. Vijender Gupta, Leader of Opposition. The Chair Ruled that the said Notice is not admissible as there is no provision of Censure Motion in the Rules of Procedure and conduct of Business.
26.05.2015	1st session (part-III)	The Chair ruled that the matter raised by Sh. Jarnail Singh (Tilak Nagar) be referred to the Committee of Privileges. He directed the Committee to consider the said issue and inquire into the matter at the earliest.

14.02.2014	1st session (part-II)	Shri Rambir Singh Bidhuri, Hon'ble Member sought to know about the fate of the notice of Breach of Privilege and Contempt of the House given by him under Rule-66 regarding fixing of the sitting of the House on the occasion of Ravidas Jayanti. The Chair ruled that such an occasion should be utilized for the disposal of impestant works for the benefit of society and that was the true tribute to revered saint Ravidas. It has been clearly mentioned in the 'Practice & Procedure of Parliament' by Kaul & Shakhder that "In fixing the sittings, no note is taken of the other restricted holidays under the Government of India."
07.01.2014	1st session	Dr. Harsh Vardhan, Leader of Opposition and Dr. Jagdish Mukhi sought to know about the decision taken on the notice of Calling Attention (Rule-54) given by them regarding providing basic amenities to the families of Pakistani Hindus on humanitarian ground and negligence of Chanan Devi Hospital Administration respectively. Prof. Jagdish Mukhi also sought to know about the decision taken on the notice by him under Rule-280. The Chair ruled that these issues could be raised during discussion on the Motion of Thanks on Lt. Governor's Address. Moreover, in the Practice & Procedure of Parliament' by Kaul & Shakhder, it has been clearly mentioned that "Discussion on the Address is generally not interrupted during the course of the sitting of the House by any other business. Only business of a formal character can be transacted on these days before the House commences or continues the discussion on the Address". Hence, Calling Attention on the aforesaid issues can not be allowed. He requested the Members to co-operate in smooth conduct of the proceeding of the House. He further stated that the aforesaid notices have been forwarded to the Ministers concerned for their comments.
FOURTH ASSEMBLY		
29.08.2013	14th session	Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra, Leader of Opposition & Shri Subhash Sachdeva, Hon'ble Member sought to know about the decision taken on the notice of Adjournment Motion given by them under Rule-59 regarding incidents of deaths due to polluted water in Delhi. They requested the Chair that discussion on the aforesaid issue be initiated after suspending the other business of the House. The Chair ruled that in the 'Practice & Procedure of Parliament' by Kaul & Shakhder, it has been clearly mentioned that, "A matter which can be raised under any other procedural device, viz., questions, half-an-hour discussion etc. cannot be raised through an adjournment motion." Hon'ble Speaker further stated that the Members can express their views during Question Hour and under Special Mention. The business of the House has already been listed for the day which can not be changed or suspended. The Chair did not allow the Adjournment Motion.

22.03.2013	13th session	The subject matter of Shri Sunil Kumar Vaidya, Ch. Surender Kumar and Shri Mohan Singh Bisht was not listed in the list of Business but they wanted to speak. The Chair ruled that their subject matters shall be forwarded to the concerned departments for furnishing reply to them.
26.03.2013	13th session	The Chair ruled that in view of the Holi festival and discussion on Budget; the matters to be raised by the following Members under Rule – 280 will be treated as read and these shall be forwarded to the concerned departments for furnishing reply
13.12.2012	12th session	Hon'ble Speaker ruled that these Members be suspended from the service of the House for two sittings and asked the Marshals to carry out his direction.
12.12.2012	12th session	The Chair Ruled that the issue raised by Shri Mukesh Sharma is of urgent public importance and Members of both Ruling Party as well as Opposition are interested in the discussion on this issue, so the Motion of Shri Mukesh Sharma may be taken up.
06.06.2012	10th session	The Chair ruled that reading newspaper in the August House is violation of Rule-261 of Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the House.
11.01.2012	9th session	<p>Shri Anil Bhardwaj, Hon'ble Member stated that Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra, Leader of Opposition had misled the House in his speech delivered yesterday during the Motion of Thanks and passed remarks against a person who was not a member of this House.</p> <p>Members of Bhartiya Janta Party stood up on their seats and raised objections on the aforesaid issue. Some Members of Congress Party also stood up on their seats.</p> <p>Exchange of arguments between the Members of Ruling Party and Opposition Party. Sloganeering from both sides. The Chair ruled that such type of incidents were not healthy for dignity and decorum of the House. As per established parliamentary norms; name of a person who is not a Member of the House, should not be mentioned in the speeches. He requested all Members that this tradition should be followed and be taken care of in future.</p>
10.01.2012	9th session	<p>Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra, Leader of Opposition stated that 70% samples of milk taken from Delhi by the Food Safety Standards Authority of India had been found contaminated. He requested that the Government should make a statement in this regard. The Chair asked Dr. A.K. Walia, Minister of Health to give statement on the aforesaid issue.</p> <p>Minister of Health stated that no contamination was found in the samples and the milk being supplied in Delhi was not adulterated. Some Members of Bhartiya Janta Party were not satisfied with the statement of the Minister. They stood up on their seats and raised objections. The Chair directed that the concerns raised by the Members might be genuine. So, the department should be made alert in this regard and all the possible measures should be taken to curb the adulteration, if any, in the milk.</p>

30.11.2011	8th session (part-II)	The Chair stated that a notice of Short Duration Discussion has been received from Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra and other Members of Bhartiya Janta Party seeking discussion on the situation arising out of the permission granted by the Government of India to the Multi National Companies to invest in the retail business. The Chair gave his ruling that the aforesaid issue relates to the Central Government and Delhi Government could not make any reply on it. Hence, discussion could not be allowed on the aforesaid issue.
30.11.2011	8th session (part-II)	The Chair further stated that a notice of Short Duration Discussion has been received from Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra and other Members of Bhartiya Janta Party seeking discussion on the situation arising out of the hike in power tariff. The Chair gave his ruling that hike in power tariff was announced in August 2011 and some Members of this House had also moved Calling Attention Motion on 30th August, 2011 in this Eighth Session of the House. It was discussed at length and the Minister of Power had also replied to the discussion and he had also clarified the queries raised by some Members.
05.09.2011	8th session	The Chair stated that notices of amendments in the aforesaid Bill ('The Members of Legislative Assembly of the National Capital Territory of Delhi (Salaries, Allowances, Pension, etc.)(Amendment) Bill, 2011' (Bill No. 8 of 2011) have been received from Hon'ble Members Shri Subhash Chopra, Shri Mukesh Sharma, Shri Neeraj Basoya, Shri Hasan Ahmad and Shri Vipin Sharma for deleting Clause 7 of the Bill, proposing amendment of Section 8A of the Principal Act. The Chair ruled that the proposed amendments are irrelevant and therefore, the consent to move these amendments has not been given due to reasons specified in Sub-Rule (vi) of Rule-142 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business.
02.09.2011	8th session	The Chair ruled that Proviso of Rule 68 of the Rules of Procedure & Conduct of Business of Legislative Assembly lays down "that if the complaint is against a member, the Speaker, before giving his consent and determining its admissibility, shall hear him after giving an opportunity to inspect the concerned documents, if any, and if need be, may also hear the complainant or any other member." Therefore, the aforesaid notices have been sent to Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra, Leader of Opposition for his comments. As and when the comments will be received from him, Hon'ble Members would be informed about the action taken in this regard.
01.09.2011	8th session	The Chair ruled that a notice of Breach of Privilege and Contempt of the House, under Rule-66 of the Rules of Procedure & Conduct of Business of Legislative Assembly had been received from Prof. V.K. Malhotra against Smt. Sheila Dikshit, Chief Minister in which Prof. Malhotra had stated that Smt. Sheila Dikshit had misled the House and also made groundless charges against him by saying that being the Vice Chairman of the Organizing Committee of Commonwealth Games he was

		<p>equally responsible, as Shri Suresh Kalmadi for the corruption in the Organizing Committee. Proviso of Rule 68 of the Rules of Procedure & Conduct of Business of Legislative Assembly lays down “that if the complaint is against a member, the Speaker, before giving his consent and determining its admissibility, shall hear him after giving an opportunity to inspect the concerned documents, if any, and if need be, may also hear the complainant or any other member.” Therefore, the aforesaid notice has been sent to Smt. Sheila Dikshit, Chief Minister for her comments. As and when the comments will be received from her, Hon’ble Member would be informed about the action taken in this regard.</p>
01.09.2011	8th session	<p>Hon’ble Speaker ruled that these Members be suspended from the service of the House for three sittings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra 2. Dr. Jagdish Mukhi 3. Dr. Harshvardhan 4. Shri Sahab Singh Chauhan 5. Shri Jai Bhagwan Aggarwal 6. Shri Mohan Singh Bisht 7. Shri Dharam Deo Solanki 8. Shri Ravinder Nath Bansal 9. Shri S.P. Ratawal 10. Shri Kulwant Rana 11. Shri Ramesh Bidhuri 12. Shri Subhash Sachdeva 13. Shri Naresh Gaur 14. Shri Manoj Kumar Shokeen 15. Shri Sri Krishan Tyagi 16. Shri Sunil Kumar 17. Shri Sat Prakash Rana 18. Shri Shyam Lal Garg 19. Shri Parduyrn Rajput 20. Shri Karan Singh Tanwar 21. Shri O.P. Babbar 22. Dr. S.C.L. Gupta

		<p>23. Shri Anil Jha</p> <p>24. Shri Harsharan Singh Balli</p>
01.09.2011	8th session	<p>Shri Tarvinder Singh Marwah and Shri Anil Kumar wanted to know the action taken by the Chair on the Privilege Motion moved by them against Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra regarding indecorous and unparliamentary behaviour shown by the Members of Bhartiya Janta Party in the House on 29 and 30th August, 2011. The Chair ruled that the notices of Shri Tarvinder Singh Marwah and Shri Anil Kumar have been sent to Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra for his comments. As and when the comments will be received from him, Hon'ble Members would be informed about the action taken in this regard.</p>
30.08.2011	8th session	<p>The Chair directed the following Members of the BJP to withdraw from the House for the remainder of day's sitting for their disorderly conduct and asked the Marshals to carry out his direction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra 2. Dr. Jagdish Mukhi 3. Dr. Harshvardhan 4. Shri Sahab Singh Chauhan 5. Shri Jai Bhagwan Aggarwal 6. Shri Mohan Singh Bisht 7. Shri Dharam Deo Solanki 8. Shri Ravinder Nath Bansal 9. Shri S.P. Ratawal 10. Shri Kulwant Rana 11. Shri Ramesh Bidhuri 12. Shri Subhash Sachdeva 13. Shri Naresh Gaur 14. Shri Manoj Kumar Shokeen 15. Shri Sri Krishan Tyagi 16. Shri Sunil Kumar 17. Shri Sat Prakash Rana 18. Shri Shyam Lal Garg 19. Shri Parduymn Rajput 20. Shri Karan Singh Tanwar 21. Shri O.P. Babbar

			<p>22. Dr. S.C.L. Gupta</p> <p>23. Shri Anil Jha</p> <p>24. Shri Harsharan Singh Balli</p>
30.08.2011	8th session		The Chair ruled that a notice of Adjournment Motion had been received from the Leader of Opposition on the aforesaid issues. As per Sub Rule (2) of Rule-61 of Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Assembly, “not more than one matter shall be discussed on the same motion”. As Hon’ble Leader of opposition had mentioned more than one issue in the text of his notice; it was not in conformity with the above rule. Hence, the consent to move the Motion has not been given.
29.08.2011	8th session		The Chair gave his ruling that as per Sub Rule-(9) of Rule-61 read with Sub Rule (O) of Rule-2 of Rule of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Assembly, “The Motion shall relate to a matter which is primarily the concern of the Government and ‘Government’ means the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi”. He disallowed the notice stating that Shunglu Committee and CAG were not under the purview of Delhi Government. Action on the report of Shunglu Committee would be taken by the Government of India as this report was under the consideration of Groups of Ministers, Government of India whereas the report of CAG was under the consideration of the Public Accounts Committee of Parliament.
18.03.2011	7th session		Shri Mukesh Sharma sought to know about his Privilege Motion given under rule – 66 against Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra, Dr. Jagdish Mukhi, Shri Shyam Lal Garg and Shri Kulwant Rana. The Chair ruled that he is examining the matter and would inform the Hon’ble Member at appropriate time.
18.03.2011	7th session		Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra, Leader of Opposition raised a notice of Breach of Privilege under Rule-66 and stated that some persons entered the precinct of the Assembly Secretariat illegally in the noon raised slogans, demonstrated and also burnt the effigy in the presence of S.H.O. (Civil Lines) as well as ACP (Security).The Chair ruled that it is a serious matter and necessary action should be taken in this regard.
21	16.03.2011	7th session	The Chair ruled that there is no provision for Censure Motion in the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of Delhi Legislative Assembly and the matter is already under consideration of Hon’ble President of India. As per Section 12(2) of Delhi Lokayukta & Up-Lokayukta Act, 1995, a time period of three months has been prescribed for the Hon’ble President for taking decision on the recommendation of Lokayukta. Further, as per Rule 264(f) of the Rules of Procedure & Conduct of Business in Delhi Legislative Assembly Rules, the conduct of the President cannot be reflected. Therefore, Hon’ble Speaker did not allow the Censure Motion to be raised in the House.

01.12.2010	6th session	As soon as the House assembled, Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra, Leader of Opposition sought to know the fate of his notices of breach of privileges under rule- 66 against Chief Minister and Shri Mukesh Sharma, MLA.Hon'ble Speaker ruled that he had sent the copies of notices to Chief Minister and Shri Mukesh Sharma for their comments and as & when the reply is received it will be provided to the Member.
01.12.2010	6th session	Shri Rajesh Liloithia, Hon'ble Member brought a notice of breach of privilege under Rule-66 against Shri Parduymn Rajput & Dr. Harshvardhan, Members of Bhartiya Janta Party for snatching the papers from Dr. A. K.Walia, Hon'ble Finance Minister to interrupt the proceedings of the House.The Chair ruled that it is the contempt of the august House and under Rule 77 (a), the Chair warned these Members to be careful in the future.
26.11.2010	6th session	<p>Hon'ble Speaker ruled that these Members be suspended from the service of the House for the three sittings of House.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra 2. Dr. Jagdish Mukhi 3. Dr. Harshvardhan 4. Shri Sahab Singh Chauhan 5. Shri Jai Bhagwan Aggarwal 6. Shri Mohan Singh Bisht 7. Shri Dharam Deo Solanki 8. Shri Ravinder Nath Bansal 9. Shri S.P.Ratawal 10. Shri Kulwant Rana 11. Shri Ramesh Bidhuri 12. Shri Subhash Sachdeva 13. Shri Naresh Gaur 14. Shri Manoj Kumar Shokeen 15. Shri Sri Krishan Tyagi 16. Shri Sunil Kumar 17. Shri Sat Prakash Rana 18. Shri Shyam Lal Garg 19. Shri Parduymn Rajput 20. Shri Karan Singh Tanwar

		21. Shri O.P.Babber 22. Dr. S.C.L.Gupta
25.11.2010	6th session	Hon'ble Speaker ruled that these Members be suspended from the service of the House for the remaining proceedings for today. 1. Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra 2. Dr. Jagdish Mukhi 3. Dr. Harshvardhan 4. Shri Sahab Singh Chauhan 5. Shri Jai Bhagwan Aggarwal 6. Shri Mohan Singh Bisht 7. Shri Dharam Deo Solanki 8. Shri Ravinder Nath Bansal 9. Shri S.P.Ratawal 10. Shri Kulwant Rana 11. Shri Ramesh Bidhuri 12. Shri Subhash Sachdeva 13. Shri Naresh Gaur 14. Shri Manoj Kumar Shokeen 15. Shri Anil Jha 16. Shri Sri Krishan Tyagi 17. Shri Sunil Kumar 18. Shri Sat Prakash Rana 19. Shri Shyam Lal Garg 20. Shri Parduymn Rajput 21. Shri Karan Singh Tanwar 22. Shri O.P.Babber 23. Dr. S.C.L.Gupta
25.11.2010	6th session	The Chair ruled that it is the responsibility of all Hon'ble Members to maintain the decorum and dignity of the august House. We may solve the problems of the residents of Delhi through healthy manner of discussion in the House.
23.11.2010	6th session	Hon'ble Speaker ruled that these Members be expelled from the remaining proceedings of the House for today.

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra 2. Dr. Jagdish Mukhi 3. Shri H.S.Balli 4. Dr. Harshvardhan 5. Shri Sahab Singh Chauhan 6. Shri Jai Bhagwan Aggarwal 7. Shri Mohan Singh Bisht 8. Shri Dharam Deo Solanki 9. Shri Ravinder Nath Bansal 10. Shri S.P.Ratawal 11. Shri Kulwant Rana 12. Shri Ramesh Bidhuri 13. Shri Subhash Sachdeva 14. Shri Naresh Gaur 15. Shri Manoj Kumar Shokeen 16. Shri Anil Jha 17. Shri Sri Krishan Tyagi 18. Shri Sunil Kumar 19. Shri Sat Prakash Rana 20. Shri Shyam Lal Garg 21. Shri Parduymn Rajput 22. Shri Karan Singh Tanwar
20.08.2010	5th session	The Chair stated that Short Duration Discussion on Law & Order could not be held on 19 th August 2010 due to the absence of Police Commissioner in the Officers' Gallery. It was a matter of disrespect towards the House and the sentiments of Hon'ble Members. The Chair stated that the aforesaid issue was very serious and directed the Government to always ensure the presence of Police Commissioner in the Officers' Gallery in future as and when discussion on Law & Order or similar issues is taken up in the House.
19.08.2010	5th session	The Chair directed the Chief Minister to ensure the presence of Commissioner of Police, Delhi in the House.
18.08.2010	5th session	Hon'ble Speaker ruled that he had received the Calling Attention Notices from Shri Hari Shanker Gupta regarding miserable condition of Public Toilets, Ch. Surender Kumar regarding encroachment on Government land in Gokulpur area & Shri Asif Mohammad Khan on the issue of spread of

		Dengue in Okhla area and due to shortage of time it would not be possible to be listed for discussion, however, the notices were sent to concerned Ministers for their comments.
17.08.2010	5th session	The Chair ruled that under Rule-61 (6) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of the Assembly and also as mentioned in the Practice & Procedure of Parliament by Kaul & Shakdher – “the motion shall not anticipate a matter, which has been already fixed for consideration. As the issue of Commonwealth Games was already listed for discussion under Rule-55, the Hon’ble Speaker did not give his consent to the Motion.
25.03.2010	4th session	The Chair delivered his ruling that ideally no statement should be given outside the House during the Session but the Chief Minister has already clarified that she had not made any such statement. Therefore, there is <i>no question of impropriety involved</i> .
25.03.2010	4th session	On the issue of Contempt of the House, Hon’ble Speaker stated that in the Practice & Procedure of Parliament by Kaul & Shakdher, it has been clearly mentioned that, “ <i>No privilege of Parliament is involved if statements on matter of public interest are not first made in the House and are made outside.</i> ”
23.03.2010	4th session	The Chair delivered his ruling on the notice of Shri Hari Shanker Gupta that the House has its own dignity and Delhi Legislative Assembly has been considered as a model House all over the country. Every Member should follow the rules and regulations of the Parliamentary procedure and “ immature publicity to various matters connected with the business of the House is an act of impropriety” as emphasized in the Practice & Procedure of Parliament by Kaul & Shakdher.
16.12.2009	3rd session	Minister of Transport requested the Chair that the expelled Members of Bhartiya Janta Party may be called in the House. The Chair directed that all expelled Members may be allowed to participated in the proceedings.
22.06.2009	2nd session	Shri Raj Kumar Chauhan, Minister of Development made a statement regarding the issuance of SC, ST & OBC certificates on objections raised by Shri Karan Singh Tanwar. Hon'ble Speaker ruled that the Assembly Secretariat will examine the issue along with the papers submitted by the Development Minister.
29.06.2009	2nd session	Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra, Leader of Opposition raised the issue of law & order arising due to the shortage of water and electricity in the Capital and sought the fate of the notice of Adjournment Motion & Notice given under Rule-290 in which he had requested to suspend all the business of the House and to allow discussion on the aforesaid issue. The Chair ruled out the demand of the Opposition Members of Adjournment Motion as it was not in accordance with Rule 61(2) and Rule 61(6) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of the Business of the Assembly.

29.06.2009	2nd session	The Chair ruled that due to the availability of time Under Rule 42 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of the Business of the Assembly, the questions of the Members absent can also be asked by other Members if they are interested.
25.06.2009	2nd session	Shri Kanwar Karan Singh, Hon'ble Member sought the fate of his Calling Attention Notice regarding the termination of 790 workers of Hardayal Municipal Library. The Chair ruled that though the matter is of urgent public importance but it was not admissible due to the shortage of time. However the notice has been sent to the Minister concerned and also ruled that the Members can raise this issue under Rule-280.
24.06.2009	2nd session	Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra, Leader of Opposition raised the matter of shortage of potable water in the Capital. The Chair ruled that the demand of the Hon'ble Leader of Opposition was not in accordance with the Rules & convention of the Assembly. Therefore it was not acceptable.
25.02.2009	1st session (part-II)	Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra, Leader of Opposition objected to the passing of the Vote on Account without any discussion. The other members of the Opposition also expressed their anguish and demanded discussion. The Hon'ble Speaker referred to the Parliamentary procedure and other established conventions and gave his ruling that normally, the Vote on Account is not discussed in the House and passed without discussion. And the convention that there will be no discussion on Vote on Accounts is contravention of the Constitution.

THIRD ASSEMBLY

25.03.2008	13th session	Shri Mukesh Sharma & other Members of ruling party raised the matter regarding an attack on Shri Surender Kumar, MLA during official function. On the direction of the Chair, Shri Surender Kumar informed the House about the incident. Some Members from the ruling party and opposition party started raising the issue causing disturbance to the proceeding of the House. The Chair directed the Chief Minister to submit report in this regard by Friday ie, 28th March, 2008.
14.09.2007	11th session	Dr. Jagdish Mukhi raised the issue regarding notice of Calling Attention Motion given under rule 54. The Chair ruled that since the matter is under investigation by CBI, the House should wait till the investigation is over.
10.03.2006	7th session	Shri Ramvir Singh Bidhuri and Shri Sahab Singh Chauhan raised a point of order regarding non-inclusion of adoption of PAC report in the list of business. The Chair gave the ruling on non-inclusion of adoption of Fourth PAC report in the list of business.
07.03.2009	7th session	The Chair gave a ruling that replies to the Calling Attention notices received from members would be made available after receiving comments from concerned department.
04.08.2004	2nd session	Dr. Jagdish Mukhi raised the issue of his breach of privilege notice against the Minister of Finance. The Chair ruled that he was not allowing the notice of breach of privilege.

26.07.2004	2nd session	Dr. Jagdish Mukhi sought to know the fate of his notice regarding arrest of a Corporator by the CBI. The Chief Minister intervened. The Chair ruled that as the matter pertained to an individual only and was of limited importance and as the law enforcement agencies were already seized of the matter he was not allowing the Calling Attention Motion.
23.07.2004	2nd session	Members rose to their feet and demanded action against the Governor of Rajasthan for making derogatory remarks against the Chief Minister of Delhi. The Chair ruled that as the matter related to the Governor of Rajasthan it would not be proper to raise the issue in the House.
23.07.2004	2nd session	Shri Bheeshm Sharma sought to know the fate of his notice of breach of privilege against Dr Harsh Vardhan who had allegedly made remarks reflecting on the impartiality of the Chair. The Chair ruled that although, under the Rules of Procedure and established parliamentary practice the issue could be termed as a breach of privilege, however, he was not referring the matter to the Privileges Committee at present.
22.07.2004	2nd session	<p>Ruling regarding notices of breach of privilege:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Chair stated that a notice had been received from Shri Ramvir Singh Bidhuri, Shri Bheeshm Sharma and Shri Ranbir Singh Kharb regarding breach of privilege motion against Shri Sahab Singh Verma for making derogatory remarks against Shri Raj Kumar Chauhan, Minister of Development. The chair ruled that although, he was not allowing the notice, it would be better if such incidences should have been avoided. 2. Chair stated that he had received two notices of breach of privilege from Shri Vijay Jolly regarding release of runds for MLA Area Development Fund and entry of vehicles of MLAs in the Delhi Sachivalaya. The Chair ruled that although the issues could not be strictly termed as breach of privilege, he was asking the Hon'ble Chief Minister to look into the issues as it involved the interests of all the MLAs. 3. Chair stated that he had received a notice of breach of privilege from Dr. Jagdish Mukhi against the Minister of Finance. Dr. Jagdish Mukhi stated that portions of the budget proposal had been leaked to the press before its presentation and it amounted to a breach of privilege. <p>The Chair ruled that the notice was premature as the budget had not been presented and hence the authenticity of the press report could not be verified. Moreover, he added, "Leakage of budget proposals or official secrets does not form any basis for a breach of privilege."</p>

24.03.2004	1st session (part-II)	Dr. Jagdish Mukhi, Leader of Opposition sought the leave of the House to move Adjournment Motion. As more than 1/6 th of the Members stood in favour of leave being granted, the Chair intimated that the leave to move the Adjournment Motion was granted. He further directed that in accordance with the provisions of the Rules of Procedure the Adjournment Motion be taken up at 1.00 PM.
------------	-----------------------	---

SECOND ASSEMBLY

03.07.2003	16th session (part-I)	Members of the Opposition party objected to the presence of non-officials in the Officers' gallery and entry of unauthorized vehicles in the Assembly Complex. The Chair directed that all unauthorized persons be removed from the galleries and vehicles without proper authorization be sent out of the complex.
26.11.2002	15th session	Shri Harsharan Singh Balli and Dr Jagdish Mukhi questioned the propriety of Deputy Speaker to preside over a discussion listed in her name and the Chair ruled that there was no violation of Rules.
15.07.2002	13th session	Ruling of the Speaker regarding laying of the papers on Table of the House: Apart from sending 70 copies of Notifications or Orders to the Secretary, Delhi Legislative Assembly for laying on the Table of the House, the Departments should give advance notice of the same. The Secretary will enlist the same in the Agenda. On the fixed date the concerned Minister will be asked to lay the copies of Notifications and Orders on the Table of the House in accordance with the right procedure.
15.04.2002	12th session	Ruling on notice of Calling Attention Motion: Chair informed the House that a notice of Calling Attention Motion had been received from Dr. Jagdish Mukhi regarding a statement by the Leader of Opposition in the Lok Sabha and other Congress Leaders casting aspersions on the Prime Minister. However, the Chair ruled that as the subject matter did not concern the Government or Delhi Assembly, the same has been disallowed
08.04.2002	12th session	Dr. Jagdish Mukhi, Leader of Opposition was asked to take the leave of the House regarding his notice on Adjournment Motion given under Rule 59. As more than 1/6th members stood in favour of the Motion, Chair ruled that leave was granted and announced that Rule 64 says it should be taken up one hour before the termination of the business. However, as the matter was important, the Motion would be taken up at 4.30 PM.
28.03.2002	12th session	Hon'ble Speaker ruled that in view of the cancellation of sitting held on 27th March, 2002, the replies to Starred and Unstarred Questions listed for that day would be treated to have been laid on the Table of the House.
19.12.2001	11th session	Ruling on Censure Motion: Shri Jagdish Mukhi tried to move a censure motion against the Chief Minister. The Chair ruled that as an adjournment motion had already been discussed on 18.12.01

		which has an element of censure, on the same subject and there was no provision of censure motion in the Rules, he had disallowed the notice for censure motion.
18.12.2001	11th session	Ruling on Adjournment Motion: Dr. Jagdish Mukhi was asked to take the leave of the House regarding his notice of adjournment given under Rule 59. As more than 1/6 members stood in favour of the Motion, Chair ruled that leave was granted and Motion would be taken up at 5.00 PM.
18.12.2001	11th session	Ruling on Motion under Rule 107: Shri Shoaib Iqbal sought to know the fate of his motion under Rule 107 regarding alleged irregularities in the purchase of coffins by the Ministry of Defence. The Chair ruled that he had disallowed the notice as it was not a matter primarily of the concern of the Government of Delhi.
15.06.2001	9th session	The Member had given notice to the effect that the Chief Minister had committed a breach of privilege by calling the Special Session to discuss the Virendra Prakash Committee Report, as the Cabinet had already approved the Report and forwarded the same to the Government of India and therefore the Special Session was not necessary. The Chair disallowed the notice of breach of privilege on the grounds that it was the Lt. Governor who summons a session and not the Chief Minister and as such this power of the Lt. Governor vested in him under the GNCTD Act could not be challenged by any Member in the garb of a notice of breach of privilege.
15.06.2001	9th session	Sh. Nand Kishore Garg and Sh Sahab Singh Chauhan, BJP Members returned and Sh Nand Kishore Garg sought to know the fate of the notice of his resolution. The Chair ruled that as per prevailing parliamentary practices and precedences, whenever notices on a similar subject were received from the Government and also a private member, priority was always given to the notice received from the Government and hence the notice received from the Government was given priority and listed.
29.03.2001	8th session	Sh. Ram Bhaj raised issue relating to naming of members of his party. Chair named Sh. Ram Bhaj for his continued disturbance. Sh. Mangat Ram Singhal moved that all the thirteen members who have been named may be suspended from the service of the House for three sittings. The motion was put to vote and adopted. Giving ruling on notices of breach of privilege by Sh. Mukesh Sharma against Dr Jagdish Mukhi, Sh. Chartilal Goel, Ch Fateh Singh and Sh. Alok Kumar, Chair informed the House that it was unfortunate that all these member while making statement in press had cast aspersions on the Chair and he has sent a copy of the notice to Dr Mukhi as per rules for his comments and referred the case against the other three persons to the Committee on Privileges for investigations and report.

28.03.2001	8th session	Chair while giving ruling on the notice of resolution for removal of Speaker given by the BJP Members informed the House that since the notice did not fulfill the requirements of Rule 252 and 253 and hence the notice has been rejected	
02.08.2000	6th session	Hon'ble speaker ruled that summoning/prorogation is ordered by the Lt. Governor on the advice of Chief Minister or the Council of Ministers. It is the Chief Minister or the Council of Ministers who decide as to when a session is to be called and for how much duration. However, he added that he has discussed the matter with the Chief Minister who has agreed to the convening of the Monsoon Session of the Assembly shortly. He has, therefore, not admitted the notice.	
02.08.2000	6th session	Shri Jagdish Anand raised matter regarding notice of Breach of Privilege and contempt of the House given by him regarding non-implementation of a resolution passed by the House on 09.4.99 by the Govt. Hon'ble Speaker ruled that resolutions only expresses the will of the House and are not binding on the Govt. Moreover, the notice neither indicated the individual guilty thereof nor was supported by any documents and hence was inadmissible.	
02.08.2000	6th session	A Member (Shri Jagdish Anand) sought clarification as to whether the name of Lt. Governor could be taken while discussing the subject matter of the day's agenda. The Chair citing various provisions in the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business ruled that no discussion could take place about the character or conduct of the Lt. Governor. However, reference could be made to the functions discharged by him in his official or public capacity.	
07.04.2000	5th session	As soon as the House assembled, Sh. Nand Kishore Garg sought the ruling of the Chair as to whether the Parliamentary Secretary can act as a Minister since the NCT Act makes no mention of Parliamentary Secretary and that a Government Resolution has been passed by the House on the previous day and the notice of which can be given only by a Minister. Speaker ruled that in Govt. of NCT Act, 1991 and Assembly Rules, the post of Parliamentary Secretary does not find mention anywhere. However, the House had passed a Resolution on 1.4.1999 to the effect that the Parliamentary Secretary should perform all such functions which are performed by his counterparts in other Legislatures. It was in the backdrop of this Resolution that he had accepted a notice of a Government Resolution under Rule-90.	
18	30.03.2000	5th session	Giving his ruling on the two notices regarding removal of Dy. Speaker given notice of by sh. Jagdish Anand and 16 other Members, the Speaker informed the House that the notice was defective on three counts viz. i) it was not addressed to the Secretary as per rules. ii) makes no mention of the rule under which it has been given and;

		<p>iii) is violative of Rule 253 (iii) as it contains charges, imputations and defamatory statements. As regards the second notice on the same issue, the Chair informed that the notice was in order but the notice period of 14 days could not be achieved as the present Session would last only upto 7.4.2000 and Chief Minister with whom matter was discussed, has informed that the Govt. does not intend to immediately reconvene the Session after its adjournment sine dine on 7th April, Hence the notice automatically lapse.</p>
27.03.2000	5th session	The Chair advised the Govt. that as per the provisions of Rule 106 and keeping in view the importance and established parliamentary conventions, a status report about the resolution/motions passed from time to time should be laid on the Table of the House in subsequent sessions for the information of the Hon'ble Members.
24.03.2000	5th session	The Speaker ruled that notices of Special Mentions given under Rule 287 should be very brief and concise not exceeding 8-10 lines and the members should strictly adhere to the written text only to save time of the House.
05.04.1999	2nd session	<p>Hon'ble Speaker gave the following ruling regarding admissibility and movi no of Resolutions/Motions: In the last few days, I have observed that there is a growing tendeny on the part of some members to sudenly bring forward Resolutions/Motions in the House on various issues without supplying me, in advance, even the texts thereof, what to speak of notice. I have, in a few cases, allowed them to be placed before the House for nermission. This I did because in the previous Vidhan Sabha this had become the culture and practie. I have now read and re-read the rules relating to admissibility of Resolutions. I find that there had been a general circumventiion of this provision in the past. The rules say- and Hon'ble Members may read them again- that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) if a Private Member wants to move a Resolution, he is required to give 15 days of advance notice; and ii) if the Government wants to move a Resolution, the Minister is required to give 7 days advance notice. <p>The Speaker, however, has the power to relax the period of notice. Bringing Resolutions sudenly and without notice in the House has the following adverse effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Not all the Members are in a postion to know as to what the Resoluton is all about. ii) At times even my Seretariat and the press and media covering the proceedings are unaware of its text. iii) Since Resolutions are brought suddenly and instantly, the Members are deprived of their legitimate right to give amendments, if they so desire.

		iv) Even proper discussion does not take place on the Resolutions which may be of general public importance. In the interest of healthy Parliamentary traditions Hon'ble Members are requested not to move Resolutions/Motions suddenly and instantly. Unless sufficient advance written notice (along with the text of the same) is supplied to me for circulation amongst the Members, it may not be possible for me to grant permission for moving of such Resolutions/Motions. I hope you will extend your co-operaton in this regard
01.04.1999	2nd session	Hon'ble Speaker informed the House that he has received the comments of the Chief Minister about the so called disrespect to the National Flag- a matter which was raised by Prof. Jagdish Mukhi, early in the day. The Chair observed that the Chief Minister in her comments has stated: "Some workers had brought this cake out of affection, in the one corner of which the replica of the National Flag had been designed. I had only cut a small piece of cake from the other end". In her statement the C.M. also added: "the Congress Party and my forefathers have made hundreds of sacrifices for this very Flag and this is known to them. There is no question of showing disrespect to the National Tricolour for which so many sacrifices have been made". The Chair, therefore, ruled that in view of the above, he feels that the Chief Minister has not dishonoured the National Flag knowingly or unknowingly
21.03.1997	12th session	In view of the Member's complaint that they were not receiving timely replies to their Special Mentions made under Rule 259, the Chair directed the Secretariat to inform the House of the position by Wednesday, the 26th March, 1997.
08.01.1997	11th session	Hon'ble Speaker directed the Government to take steps so that written replies to questions become available to Members one day in advance.
26.07.1996	10th session	With regard to the non-receipt of replies to a number of questions Hon'ble Speaker gave the following ruling: "Hon'ble Members I have to give a ruling on a very important matter today and this matter concerns all Hon'ble Members of this House. It is more than two and a half years that Delhi Legislative Assembly was constituted. Its Tenth Session is now going on, of the questions asked in this Assembly till date, as many as 200 questions are such to which though assurances were given, but the replies have not so far been received. Out of these 60 questions were asked one year earlier and as many as 30 questions were asked two years back by the Hon'ble Members. It should not be enough to give a reply such as "the information is being collected and will be sent later or laid on the Table". Some Hon'ble Members tend to believe as if my Secretariat is not giving replies to these questions. On the contrary, my Secretariat has time and again reminded the concerned department in this matter to expedite the reply. Some Hon'ble Members have

		complained to me several times that replies given to their questions are at times, either incomplete or only assurances are given. I find this situation quite embarrassing. Such an irresponsible behaviour on the part of the heads of departments is not fair and the executive cannot be allowed to take this House lightly. I would like to inform the officers and heads of departments that this House is a privileged House and it does have the power to punish for its contempt. As Presiding Officer of this august House, it is my onerous responsibility to uphold the rights of the members and the dignity of this House. After giving the matter a thoughtful consideration I have decided to refer this entire issue to the Question and Reference Committee of the House. I am also issuing direction to the effect that replies to all pending questions should be sent to the Assembly Secretariat within a month. The Question and Reference Committee of the House headed by Hon'ble Deputy Speaker will investigate the matter regarding non-receipt of replies. It will inform the House of the course of action through its report.
25.07.1996	10th session	In view of the concern expressed by the members on the state of affairs of Nari Niketan, Orphanages etc. run by Department of Social Welfare, the Chair directed the Minister concerned to ensure their proper functioning.
24.07.1996	10th session	On the point of order raised by Shri Deep Chand Bandhu that there was some procedural irregularity on the previous day in connection with the presentation of Demands for Grants in the House, Hon'ble Speaker ruled that after seeing the records, he is of the view that no procedural irregularity had occurred as the House had duly granted the necessary leave to the Hon'ble Finance Minister in this regard.
24.07.1996	10th session	Hon'ble Speaker gave the following ruling on the notice of Dr.A.K.Walia regarding alleged breach of privilege by the Minister of Food and Supplies:- "I received a notice of breach of privilege and contempt of the House from Dr. A.K.Walia, Hon'ble Member against Minister of Food and Supplies for giving wrong reply to two different questions 1.0. starred question No.54 dated 20.12.1995 and un-starred question No.169 dated 21.3.1996. As required under the rules I had asked for the comments of the Minister of Food and Supplies before giving my ruling in the matter. The Minister has now clarified that the discrepancies in the replies of the two questions were on account of the fact that earlier data in regard to allotment of kerosene oil depot was being maintained on the basis of 61 circles. Later when the number of circles were raised to 70 according to Assembly Constituencies, the register was changed and the information was compiled according to 70 circles. There was, however, no change in the number of kerosene oil depots as in December, 95 which stood at 311 which was also given in reply to starred question No.54, 45 new kerosene oil depots were allotted after December, 1995 and upto 18.3.1996. Adding this number to 311 in December,

		1995 the total kerosene oil depots came to 356. This was indicated in reply to 'un-starred question No.169. The Minister has categorically denied that there was any deliberate attempt on his part to mislead this August House or to give any wrong information. The Minister has also regretted the mistake. On the basis of the above clarification, no issue of breach of privilege and contempt of the House is involved. I accordingly disallow the notice of Dr.A.K.Walia.
20.03.1996	9th session	The reply given to SQ No. 22 regarding insufficiency of furniture in Sr. Secondary School falling in Okhla Assembly area being incomplete, Hon'ble Speaker referred S.Q.No. 22 and its reply given by the Minister of Health to the Questions and Reference Committee. Hon'ble Speaker directed the Minister of Health to collect complete information in respect of SQ No. 27 regarding illegal sale of school land in Daya Nand Colony (Lajpat Nagar) and apprise the House about it
22.12.1995	8th session	Hon'ble Speaker gave the following ruling regarding introduction of Private Members Bills:- "Hon'ble members would recall that on August 11, 1995 in the last session, when the matter regarding difficulties being experienced by the members in connection with the introduction of Private Members Bills in the House was raised, I had observed that the matter being important, involved as it does the rights of the private members, I would write to the Lok Sabha Sectt. for their opinion, although the opinion of the Secretary (Law) was against introduction of such Bills which involved appropriation of moneys from the Consolidated Fund of the Capital. The opinion from the Lok Sabha Secretariat has now been received. They have opined that in Lok Sabha the position is that a Bill, if enacted, involves expenditure from the Consolidated Fund of India, shall not be passed, unless the President has recommended to the House its consideration. The Lok Sabha Secretariat has, however, stated that "such Bills are not barred from introduction". The procedure in Lok Sabha in this regard is governed by Article 117 read with Article 110 of the Constitution of India. The procedure in this Assembly- in regard to such bills is governed by the provisions of Section 22 of the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi Act, 1991. The provisions of the Constitution as well as the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi Act, in this regard are analogous. The word "appropriate" as defined in World Book Dictionary at Page 102 means "to set apart for some special use". Concise Oxford Dictionary also defines the meaning of the word "appropriate" as "to devote (money etc.) to special purposes"
11.08.1995	7th session	Giving his ruling on the objection raised by Shri Jag Parvesh Chandra that Private Members Bills are not being allowed to be introduced due to incorrect interpretation of section 22 of the G.N.C.T.of Delhi Act, the Chair ruled that the opinion of the Law Department was also against introduction of Bills without the prior recommendation of Lt. Governor. However, since the matter is important

		and involves the rights of Private Members, he will be obtaining the views of Lok Sabha Secretariat also in the matter
08.08.1995	7th session	<p>In response to the point of order raised by Shri Mewa Ram Arya about the status of two members of the House viz. Shri Ajay Maken and Shri Haroon Yusuf, and on being insisted upon by the House including the Leader of the House, the Chair gave the ruling about the status of the member as under: "Whereas Shri Ajay Maken and Sh. Haroon Yusuf were elected to the Legislative Assembly of N.C.T. of Delhi on Congress (I) ticket vide Election Commission Notification No.308/LAS/93 (No.171) dated 01 December, 1993 and sworn in as Members on 14.12.1993. And whereas Shri Ajay Maken and Shri Haroon Yusuf have been expelled from the Congress (I) Legislature Party as per communication dated 3rd August, 1995, received from Sh.Jag Parvesh Chandra, Leader of the Congress (I), Legislature Party.</p> <p>And now, therefore, after careful examination of the case and in exercise of the powers conferred upon me under the Tenth Schedule to the Constitution of India, I, Charti Lal Goel, Speaker, Delhi Vidhan Sabha, do hereby declare Sh.Ajay Maken and Sh. Haroon Yusuf as unattached Members with immediate effect".</p>
23.08.1994	3rd session	<p>Hon'ble Speaker informed the House that as per assurance given in the House yesterday the 22nd August, 1994 that he would give his decision on who uttered the words "Pakistani Agent" and "I will go to 40 countries, where would you go" and to whom, after hearing the tape in the presence of leaders of various parties. Hon'ble Speaker informed the House that as per the above said announcement the tape was heard today at 12.00 hours in the Noon in the presence of S/Shri Deep Chand Bandhu, Ramvir Singh Bidhuri, Mukesh Sharma and Deputy Speaker, Shri Alok Kumar. No one was found to have called someone 'Pakistani Agent. Shri Shoaib Iqbal was heard to have uttered "that we will go to Pakistan and 40 countries, where will you go". Hon'ble Speaker ruled that such utterances in the House are condemnable and should not happen in future.</p>
25.03.1995	2nd session	<p>In response to the issue raised in the House on 24.3.1995 by Km. Purnima Sethi and Prof. P.K.Chandla, Hon 'ble Speaker informed the House that he has gone into the matter and found nothing irregular in the procedure regarding balloting of Questions and Resolutions.He also ruled that issues pertaining to the Assembly Secretariat and its working should not be raised in the House and instead should be discussed in his Chamber. Hon'ble Speaker also informed the House about the arrest of Shri Mateen Ahmed, MLA by Delhi Police.</p>