

**ANDHRA PRADESH STATE CIVIL SUPPLIES CORPORATION LIMITED,
Regd.Office: 6-3-655/1/A, Civil Supplies Bhavan, Somajiguda, Hyderabad-82**

**Sri Adhar Sinha, IAS
VC & Managing Director**

PDS/2/MOVT/FG-5/5991/2005

Dated: 23-7-2005

CIRCULAR NO. PDS-8

Sub: Certain guidelines for Stage II Movement of Rice one route Officer
for each Route – Instructions issued – Regarding

** ** *

An instance has come to light where 520 bags of SGRY (SC) rice was seized in 2 lorries of the Stage II contractor at a Groundnut Decorticating Mill which were actually meant for 3 F P Shops in a Mandal for supply under different works in the respective villages. The destination Mandal is next to the Mandal where MLSP is located. The route on which the lorries were seized is totally in opposite direction to the destination mandal route. In fact, the two routes diverge at a cross road in the center of the mandal headquarter town. The crossroad may be 1-2 KM away from MLSP. The MRO office (not of the destination mandal) is located next to MLSP as part of the mandal complex where other offices like MPDO are also located. The physical layout is being described as there may be many such similarly placed Mandals for which precautionary measures can be taken without assuming things for granted. In this connection the following points have emerged for taking necessary action.

1. The movement of the rice has taken place to a different destination i.e. Groundnut Deortication mill instead of F.P. Shops of the respective villages. The high risk of diversion to mills (pointed out in Circular No. 2) gets reiterated by this incident, requiring extra vigil at all mill premises.
2. This has possibly happened because the Route Officer who has signed the issue register has accompanied only one of the vehicles meant for one of the villages and allowed other 2 vehicles to go un-escorted.

The MRO has failed to nominate three different ROs for 3 different villages, as there was no link between supply of rice to one village with that of the other. Alternatively, if one route officer was available then he should have issued only one RO at a time and issued the other 2 ROs after securing completion report of first movement.

Therefore, strict instructions have to be issued to the MROs to issue one RO at a time against one Route Officer which can be combined only with the stocks meant for different shops in that route equal to one load of the vehicle; if second vehicle has to be engaged either for same or different village then separate route officer has to be appointed for that vehicle In other words, in one route covered by one vehicle different stocks for different shops can be combined but same or different routes covered by different vehicles can not be combined under one route officer. Any compromise on this point gives scope for diversion of the un-escorted vehicle and also offers an alibi to concerned officials that diversion took place due to absence of RO. HENCE EVERY VEHICLE MUST BE MOVED ONLY UNDER ESCORT OF A ROUTE OFFICER WITHOUT ANY EXCEPTION.

3. Strict instructions have to be given to the MLS in charges that in case he receives more than one RO contrary to the above instructions i.e. only one route officer for different routes; then he should issue one route/ vehicle stock at a time and inform the deviation of the instructions to the District Manager who will in turn inform the Joint Collector about the same. Under no circumstances should MLS Point in charges issue stocks of more than one route to one route officer for taking supplies to different shops in that route. Any non-compliance will lead to severe disciplinary action against such defaulters, if any.

4. In this case, it is also noted that the ROs were issued as far back as 1-2-2005 for one village, in case of other RO was issued on 14-6-05 and another RO on 22-6-05. Prima facie it appears that the entire operation has been well-planned by clubbing different ROs of different dates for different works in different villages in one combined movement by 3 vehicles.

It is therefore, clear that following lapses have taken place: - (i) neither the MRO has watched the lifting of stocks against the Release Orders issued by him (ii) nor the executing agencies who would have given the requisition for releasing the stocks in February 2005 itself have watched the arrival of stocks for works undertaken by them (iii) nor there has been any re- conciliation between the MLS Point incharge and the MRO regarding the off take of stocks for last four months. Otherwise stocks meant for releases in the month of February 2005 being lifted in July 2005 would not have taken place.

Thus, the mandal and divisional level monitoring of the works and issue of rice against wage component has not at all taken place for last four months if not more. Therefore the whole system of issue of rice against completed works has to be monitored at different stages to ensure that such un-wanted delays leading to avoidable loss and diversion do not take place. The following monitoring stages / levels need to be activated: -

- (i) Requisition for rice work-wise by Executing Agencies; Receipt of stocks at FPSD, and, Issue of coupons to labourer and its realization against rice at FPSD – Executing Agency & M.R.O.
- (ii) Issue of Release Orders by MROs and lifting of stocks against it. – Executing Agency MRO & MLSP
- (iii) Checking of Movement of stocks by Stage-II Contractor as per Issue Register. - MRO & MLSP

5. The Role of Stage II contractor who is arranging the vehicle for delivery of the rice to different villages against different ROs meant for different F P Shops could be of a dubious nature and his complicity in the whole operations is prima-facie apparent from the report. In such case, apart from Disciplinary action on the Stage II contractor, criminal proceedings may also be initiated against them to have deterrent impact if his complicity exists.

6. It is also noticed in this case that the MRO has issued ROs in the name of one F P Shop dealer whose brother is running the shop for last one year which is highly irregular and could have been avoided by taking necessary preventive steps to cancel the said irregular dealership and appoint substitute in his place. RDOs in divisional meetings ought to review such FP Shop cases and take necessary steps to rectify such irregularities, if any.

V.C. & MANAGING DIRECTOR

To

All the District Managers. They should send copy to all MLS i/c.

All the Zonal Managers. They should check up this during PV inspection and send reports in case if any deviations.

All Joint Collectors } With a request to issue circular to all Ex. Agencies
All Collectors } Es/DFOs/MPDOs etc), MROs &RDOs and MLSP I/c

Copy to Director of Civil Supplies, Hyderabad
Copy to Commissioner of Civil Supplies, Hyderabad
Copy to EOS, CAF&CS Department. Hyderabad