

***Government of Himachal Pradesh
Local Audit Department
Block No. 38, SDA Complex,
Kasumpti, Shimla-9***



***Audit and Inspection Report of Dr.Y.S. Parmar
University of Horticulture and Forestry,Nauni
Solan .***

For the Period 01.04.2011 to 31.03.2012

Preface

U

s report has been prepared for submission to the Government of U
Himachal Pradesh under article 45(3) of Himachal Pradesh Universities of U
Agriculture, Horticulture & Forestry Act, 1986.

U

2. Para-13 of the Report deals with the Financial Position, Grants-in Aid U
received from HP Govt and Govt of India and findings of pre and post U
audit of University accounts for the year 2011-12. U

U

3. Appendix IV of the Report contains the latest position of all outstanding U
Audit Paras, which were pointed out in Annual Audit Reports during the U
period 1987-88 to 2010-11 U

U

4. The latest position of all outstanding Audit Requisitions from 1994-95 to U
2010-11 has been given in Appendix-V of this report.

U

U

Executive Summary U

The following statutory officers have served in this University during the period under report U

SUN.	Designation U	Name U	Period U
1. U	Vice Chancellor U	Dr. K.R.Dhiman U	01.04.2010 to 31.03.2012 U
2. U	Registrar: U	Sh.BUR.Kamal, HPAS U	01.04.2010 to 31.03.2012 U
3. U	Comptroller U	Sh.HUCWaisU, Dy Controller U	01.04.2010 to 31.03.2012 U
U	U	Sh.U S.L.Malev, SAS	01.04.2010 to 31.03.2012 U
U	U	Sh.UGURa ta, SAS	01.04.2010 to 31.03.2012 U

U

U

U

U

U

U

U

: U

U

Major Audit Observations for the year of 2019-20

Sr. No.	Brief Description	Amount (₹)	Para
1	Non adjustment of outstanding advance as on 31.03.2020	47,88,27,475	4(a) (b)
2	Improper management of Pension Corpus Fund (Meagre balance as on 31.03.2020)	9.97 (crore)	6(a)
3 (a)	Improper management of Gratuity Corpus Fund (Meagre balance as on 31.03.2020)	22.15 (lac)	6 (b)
3(b)	Payment of Gratuity during 2019-20 from State Schemes instead of Gratuity Corpus Fund	302.03 (lac)	6 (b)
4	Engagement and further grant of extension to Sh. BUSURana, Secretary to the Vice Chancellor on contract basis against the post of Assistant Scientist without the approval of funding agency	20,000 (PM)	
5	Appointment of (Ms) Reshma as Assistant Professor (Floriculture & Landscaping) without essential qualification of NET at the time of last date of receipt of application	Regular salary drawn	3
6	Finalization of Rate contract for the supply of "Godrej Furniture and customized products without calling tenders/quotations and incurring of expenditure thereof	42.69,998	8
7	Regarding purchase of branded products/ instruments/equipments on single quotation basis and incurring of expenditure thereof	3,50,426	23
8	Purchase of LDPE Bond Lining Sheet without calling tenders	8,85,938	40
9	Regarding irregular payment of consultancy fee to University employees	70,850	42
10	Outstanding paras as on 31.03.2020	549 Nos.	Part-I

U

ANNUAL AUDIT AND INSPECTION REPORT ON THE ACCOUNTS OF U Dr. Y.S PARMAR UNIVERSITY OF HORTICULTURE AND FORESTRY, U NAUNI – SOLAN U

Period 01.04.2011 to 31.03.2012 U

Part-IU

Latest position of old audit para's U

(a) U Outstanding Audit ParasU

There are 549 audit paras outstanding, the detailed position of which U is contained in (Appendix U-IV) of this report. These audit paras are still pending for settlement, involving serious cases of misappropriation of public U money but no serious effort on the part of University authorities have been U taken to recover the huge amount involved and even the guilty were not U punished and the evidence gets faded with the passage of time. University U authorities tend to settle audit paras comprising of simple objections only just U to reduce the number of paras. Therefore, some mechanism needs to be U devised where provisions for settlement of serious audit paras, and losses/ U recovery of public funds may be reported to the U guest body. U

(b) U Outstanding Audit RequirementsU

U Detailed audit requirements containing audit observations of routine U nature is appended as (Appendix-V) of this report, which may be attended to by the concerned departments of the University. U

U

Part-II U

Present Audit U

Preliminary

(a) The present audit of accounts of the University of Horticulture and U Forestry, Nauni (Solan) for the period 01.04.2011 to 31.03.2012 was U conducted by Resident Auditors headed by Sh. Basant Singh Kanwar, U Deputy Controller (Audit). The audit report is compiled and presented by U SU Baldev Raj Sharma, Deputy Controller and the results thereof are U incorporated in the following parasUU

U

(b) The audit report has been prepared on the basis of information furnished and made available by the controlling officer of the institution. The Local Audit Department disclaims any responsibility for any misinformation or non submission of information on the part of Auditee U

U

2. Financial Position U

U

The financial position of the University for the year 2011-12 was as under:-U

U

Particular U	Amount (₹) U										
Closing Balance as per audit report for 2010-U U	57,25,83,942.68 U										
Add:- Adjustment in the annual account (as per Para U 46(7) of audit report for the period 01.04.10 to U 31.03.11 U	6,53,182.00 U										
Add:- Adjustment in opening balance of 2011-12 U	3,91,475.00 U										
<table border="1"> <tr> <th>Para No. U</th><th>Amount (₹) U</th></tr> <tr> <td>51 (k) U</td><td>(+) 10,00,000 U</td></tr> <tr> <td>51 (g) U</td><td>(-) 8,525 U</td></tr> <tr> <td>51 (U) U</td><td>(-) 6,00,000 U</td></tr> <tr> <td>(Net Amount) U</td><td>(+) 3,91,475 U</td></tr> </table>	Para No. U	Amount (₹) U	51 (k) U	(+) 10,00,000 U	51 (g) U	(-) 8,525 U	51 (U) U	(-) 6,00,000 U	(Net Amount) U	(+) 3,91,475 U	
Para No. U	Amount (₹) U										
51 (k) U	(+) 10,00,000 U										
51 (g) U	(-) 8,525 U										
51 (U) U	(-) 6,00,000 U										
(Net Amount) U	(+) 3,91,475 U										
Opening Balance as on 01.04.12	57,46,28,599.68 U										
Receipt from grant U	74,68,55,775.65 U										
Income from own sources U	0,25,76,323.00 U										
Receipt of security, earnest money, deposits etc U	2,44,47,494.00 U										
Total U	,54,85,08,192.33 U										
Expenditure U	,25,38,76,872.00 U										
Closing Balance U	29,46,31,320.33 U										

U

U

U

e financ al position called for furtUer follow ng remarks: U

U

(a) UIncome U

U

U e perusal of financ al pos tion reveals that tUe Unstitut on U s fully U dependent on tUe grants T Ue income from own sources are negl g ble iUe ₹ U 0 25 crore T U s is also not a real income as tUe major amount hUve been U received n l eu of serv ces provided by tUe University Ue for bus facilit es, U standard rent from tUe accommodat on prov ded by tUe Un vers ty and U rece pts of water electr c ty b lls etc T Ue deta ls of actual ncome hUve not U been dep cted U separately Un U spite Uf U spec fic U prov s ons Uf U rules U and U nstruct ons ssued by tUe government U n thU behUlf and further suggested U by aud t from t me to t me It is U understood tUat tUe real iUcome from its U own sources was negligible w ere as tUe University Uas a lot of potent al to U raise it U but no ser ous efforts were ever made U n tU s d rect on to make it U self suff c ent Efforts could hUve been made to raise income from its farms U by offer ng seeds, mus U room tec U hology for w c adequate iUfrastructure U and manpower was ava lable w t U t Ue Un vers ty U e farm cons st ng of U 375 U acres Uf U fert e U and U can U generate U and some U ncome U s already U suggested n eUer audit reports but no act on seems to hUve been taken in U t U s regard, w c is a matter of ser ous concern and requ res spec al U attent on of tUe Un vers ty autUor t es. U

U

(b) UExpend ture U

U e total expend ture of tUe Unvers ty dur ng tUe year under report U was ₹ U,25,38,76,872.00. U e Uead U se break up of t e expend ture s as U under: U U

Head of Account U	Amount (₹) U
Salary U	84,59,90,271.00 U
Payment of gratu ty out of state scUeme U	3,02,22,970.00 U
A U U U U U U	31,03,80U 00 U
Contingency U	27,54,57,652.40 U
Revolv ng Fund U U	3,12,346.00 U
Works U	,59,60,799.00 U
Security & Deposits U	8,28,29,032.60 U
Total U U	1,25,38,76,872.000 U

--	--

the following are the major observations of the audit with respect to the incurring of expenditure by the University:-

(i) Salary

Above figures reveal that major chunk of about 67.46% of the total expenditure has been incurred on salary. Owing to inadequate financial resources, curtailment in expenditure on account of pay and allowances and re-structuring of organizational set up is needed for the future. Therefore, the staffing pattern requires review under high-powered committee. At the same time, the possibility of amalgamation of identical departments into single department may also be explored. The contenance of two construction divisions and one architect was not just feasible/ commensurate with the execution of works involving just an expenditure of ₹ 159 crores during the period. Either some surplus technical staff be sent on secondment basis to some other Departments/Boards/ Corporations or the University should make efforts to fetch some construction works from other departments in order to utilize the services of the surplus staff which will help to increase the University income in the shape of departmental charges. These suggestions are repeatedly been incorporated in the earlier audit reports, but no sincere efforts have so far been initiated on the above lines, which needs special attention of the University authorities.

(ii) Contingency

Large fleet of vehicles

As already pointed out in the previous reports, the University has a large fleet of vehicles which cost the exchequer to the tune of ₹ One crore approximately. The number of vehicles in this University is very large in comparison to other Universities of the state. The necessity of vehicles in the public interest can very well be gauged from the facts that majority of the vehicles are running 10 to 20 Kms on an average. This sorry state of affairs is once again brought to the notice of Board of Management and Government authorities to direct the University authorities to take concrete steps to get rid of this unfruitful expenditure by bringing some vehicles under common pool as has been done in CSKHPKV Palampur.

(c) Expenditure Control - Restructuring and rationalization of manpower

The main focus of the University is teaching, research and extension. University also concentrating on some projects to generate and improve the domestic income. The detail of the entire staff is given as under:-

Sr No	Position/posts category	Sanctioned strength	Actual strength	Vacant
1	Statutory officers	0	07	3
2	Teaching/Scientific/Research Staff	350	233	7
	Teaching	04	80	24
	Research	205	2	93
	Extension	41	41	0
	Total	350	233	7
3	Administrative Ministerial and	268	239	29
4	Laboratory and field staff	235	65	70
5	Library staff	27	23	4
6	University Health Centre	6	5	1
7	Drivers and Conductors	59	47	2
8	Other miscellaneous staff	8	6	2
9	Engineering/workshop staff	43	37	6
10	Category 'D' staff	739	706	23
	Grand Total	1755	1488	267

During the Financial Year 2011-12, the teaching and non teaching staff were not posted as per the standard procedure fixed by the ICAR. It is evident from the detail given at the (Annexure A(i)-A(v)) that 203 numbers of teaching and non teaching staff are working in different schemes/departments but the salary of these staff is being drawn from the budget of different schemes/departments of the University, which require proper justification.

Sr.No	Description	No. of cases
1	Teaching/Scientific staff	31
2	Administrative/Ministerial staff	62
3	Technical and Field staff	68
4	Category 'D' staff	30
5	Drivers and Miscellaneous staff	2
TU	Total:-	203

Therefore, rationalization of entire teaching and non-teaching staff as per the standards/procedure fixed by the ICAR may be ensured.

U

(d) Observance of economy and judicious utilization of funds

U

Economy instructions have not been strictly enforced as expenditure on housing and dinner etc. are being incurred regularly. Air travels and use of taxis including personal cars are being allowed frequently contrary to the instructions of the government. Purchases are persistently being made from open market instead of approved rate contract on the slightest pretext of specifications and quality thereby throwing all norms to the winds. The plea that economy instructions are not applicable to the expenditure met out of projects is not tenable as no such exemption has been granted under economy measures. As such economy instructions should be followed in letter and spirit irrespective of the source of funds so that the project money can be judiciously utilized for necessity. Instead of spending on luxurious items such as costly furniture, refrigerators, floor mats, ovens and costly heating and cold weather arrangements including purchase of vehicles.

As already emphasized in the earlier audit reports, the following steps are required to be taken immediately to revamp the financial position of the University.

(i) Need to raise domestic income

(U) Reduction on establishment expenditure by amalgamation of identical departments.

(U) Reduction in existing number of fleet of vehicles and stoppage of its misuse

(v) Observance of economy instructions and to avoid expenditure on the purchase of luxurious items.

(v) Adherence to competitiveness and economy in purchases and transparency in consumption and utilization

(v) Ensuring proper utilization of idle machinery and curb on incurring expenditure on unfruitful investment out of projects

(vii) ~~Unnecessity of immediate follow up action on serious outstanding audit~~

paras:- Non-Compliance of audit paras for the last 00 to 15 years not only defeats the very purpose of Audit but it also affects the accountability and transparency of the institution adversely besides accumulating losses on account of non-recovery.

3. Grants

The details of grants received by the University during the year under report are given at (Appendix-I) attached to this report.

4. Position of Temporary Advances

(a) Huge amount of temporary advances pending for adjustment

Non-adjustment of advances by the various departments for the last number of years is also a matter of serious concern. The total amount, which still remains un-adjusted as on 30.03.2012 was touching a whopping figure of ₹ 42,75,00,194/- as detailed in (Appendix-II) attached to this report. The departments may be directed to expedite the adjustment of accounts along with suitable explanation for unnecessary delays in their submission. Non adjustment of pending advances is a serious lapse which needs special attention of the University authorities.

(b) Position of temporary advances of Internal Inspection cell of the University

As per information supplied by the Comptroller Office, the total amount which still remained unadjusted on account of temporary advances released upto 31.03.2012 was ₹ 5,18,26,280/- (Appendix III attached to this report). This is a serious issue and concerned departments may be directed to expedite the adjustment of these advances.

5. Retrenchment

(a) During the course of pre-audit of various bills presented by the departments, it is found that a number of cases, bills were regularly passed irregularly by the DDOs without conducting proper scrutiny of the bills. In the audit, thorough examination of the cases have been conducted which reduced the excess payment to the tune of ₹ 4,80,540/- in pre-audit which could have been paid irregularly. Therefore, necessary instructions are required to be issued to the DDOs and staff working under their control so that bills are presented to audit after conducting proper scrutiny.

(b) In addition to the direct retrenchments as shown above, number of cases pertaining to the fixation of pay and leave encasement etc were found incorrect and such cases have been withdrawn and corrected by the University at the instance of audit.

U

U

6. Management of Pension and Gratuity Corpus Fund

The pension scheme was introduced in the University vide Notification No. Bud. FC/36 Uk/neet/96-97-1300-50 dated 25/2/97. The scheme was established by creating a corpus fund transferring therefrom the CPF contribution made by the University along with interest accrued in respect of those employees who opted for the pension scheme. Further, second option was given to the left out University regular employees to opt pension scheme vide Notification No. Bud FC/68K/pension/2008-3648-98 dated 8/7/08. The comparative financial position of Pension corpus fund and Gratuity from 2005-06 to 2010-11 are given as under.

(a) Proper management of Pension Corpus Fund

year	Opening balance	Receipts/Income		Total	Expenditure /payment	Closing Balance (in crores)
		Subsc.	Intt.			
2005-06	20.83	3.07	0.19	24.29	3.12	21.17
2006-07	21.17	2.02	3.37	26.76	4.11	22.65
2007-08	22.65	2.05	63	26.53	4.75	21.80
2008-09	21.78	7.85*	47	31.10	5.41	25.69
2009-10	25.69	3.51	72	30.92	6.87	24.05
2010-11	24.05	4.02	4.33	32.40	7.92	24.48
2011-12	24.48	6.60	2.41	33.49	3.52	29.97

(* Note:- The receipts of subscription for the year 2008-09 was for ₹ 7.85 crores which includes ₹ 4.03 crores on account of transfer from CPF corpus fund, the actual subscription for this year was ₹ 2.92 crores only).

U As found in above mentioned table, the position of pension corpus fund is not also sound due to fact that new subscribers to the pension corpus fund have been reduced/stopped consequent upon the implementation of contributory pension scheme w.e.f. 05.05.2003. In view of the present position, pension corpus is likely to be exhausted by 2014-15 in the next 12 years. Moreover, huge amount is needed to meet out the payments on account of retirement benefits arrears due to revision of pensionary benefits.

(b) Improper management of Gratuity Corpus Fund

The Gratuity contribution was released on six monthly basis @ one-fourth of the basic pay drawn by the employees for the month of September paid in October and February paid in March of every year vide notification No. HF/Compt/Pen/5-5/1993/-13702-4 dated 03.03.2005. In the Gratuity corpus also, the position of funds is very poor. The University is making payment of gratuity out of the states scheme which is irregular and the same should be met out from the gratuity corpus fund. It is clear that the subscription plus interest is very low in comparison to payments made against gratuity during the year 2005-06 to 2010-12. In the year 2010-12 the payment of gratuity out of state scheme is ₹ 302.23 lacs, the payment of this heavy amount from the state schemes in place of gratuity corpus is not justifiable. The University has still not made the gratuity fund operated. Since there is closing balance of ₹ 22.5 lac only as on 30.03.2012, which is quite negligible.

U

Year	Opening Balance	Receipt sub.	Interest	Total	Exp. payment	Closing Balance (in lac)
2005-06	0.70	4.03	0.00	4.73	0.71	4.02
2006-07	4.24	0.09	0.04	4.37	-----	4.37
2007-08	4.84	0.60	0.34	5.78	-----	5.78
2008-09	5.98	0.08	0.08	6.14	-----	6.14
2009-10	6.86	0.47	7.00	9.00	-----	9.00
2010-11	9.09	0.26	0.39	9.74	-----	9.74
2011-12	9.74	0.00	2.30	22.04	-----	22.04

U

U

U

U

Expenditure Uncurred on Payment of Gratuity but of State Scheme
(Figures in lac) U

Year U	Amount U (rupees in lac) U
2005-06 U	77.75 U
2006-07 U	0.09 U
2007-08 U	46.53 U
2008-09 U	96.20 U
2009-10 U	2.6 U
2010-11 U	352.23 U
2011-12 U	302.23 U

U

U In view of above position, the matter is brought to the notice of University authorities to make a suitable policy to make the Pension corpus U fund as well as Gratuity fund self sustainable by arranging the source of U receipts of these funds to meet out the liabilities on account of pensionary U benefits including release of gratuity to the retirees in near future U

U

Irregularities detected during the year 2011-12 U

U

Registrar's Office U

U

7. Grant of five non-compounded advance increments to Dr. Rohit Bisht, Assistant Professor (Veterinary Science) and Appointment U of Dr (Ms) Santos Kumar as Assistant Scientist (S.D.C) and subsequent award of advance increments on account of her P.U.D U Degree at the time of recruitment U

U Dr. Rohit Bishist, Assistant Professor (Veterinary Science) was granted U five U non-compounded U advance U increments U vide U Registrar U office U

No. UHF/Regr/Estt-17-539/2009-984-88 Dated 04/04/2011 Read with the amendment made to the University Statute 6(3) Under Rule-1 of the notification No. UHF/Regr/GA/5-28/2010-32023-82 Dated 09.2.2010 As per provisions of amendment, five non-compounded advance increments are to be given at the time of recruitment only to the persons recruited as Assistant Professor/equivalent after 09/09/2008 and who holds the P.U.D. degree at the time of recruitment. Dr. Rohit B. S. was not having a P.U.D. degree at the time of issuance of appointment letter and it was acquired after getting the extension in joining time. Hence, these advance increments are not admissible to him. However, keeping in view the reply of Professor & Head Department of U.S. & culture and Agro-forestry. These advance increments were admitted provisionally subject to clarification from the competent authority. Similarly in case of Dr. (Ms) Santos Kumar who was appointed as Assistant Scientist (SUPC) and subsequent award of advance increments in her favour against the rules and procedures was also questioned by audit under Audit Requirement No. 2009-10/-6 Dated 04-05-2010 during the year 2010-11. It is further added that "Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of Ashok Kumar Sharma v/s Chandra Sekhar (1993 U.Supp.(2) SCC-611) has held that 'Possession of requisite educational qualification is a mandatory condition. The same should not be uncertain. If an uncertainty is allowed to prevail, the employer would be flooded with applications of ineligible candidates. A cut date for the purpose of determining the eligibility of the candidates concerned must therefore, be fixed in the advertisement, the receipt of application from an ineligible person cannot be acknowledged as it relates to the field for selection and such applications as to be rejected at the inception itself. The professional treatment given to such applications is illegal as many who do not possess eligibility condition could have restrained themselves from applying on the ground of ineligibility'. Similar view was taken in Bupendra Singh v/s State of Punjab (2000 SCC L & S) 639 and Shankar Kumar Mandal v/s State of Bihar (2003 SCC(L&S) 45) As per citation of the Court the preferential treatment given to such appointments is illegal in the eyes of law." Therefore, both these cases and other like cases (if any) are likely to be decided in the light of the aforesaid court judgments/orders. However, University authorities may seek legal opinion to settle the cases accordingly or seek the clarification from the Finance Department of HP Govt through the Administrative Department of the University. U

U

U

{AR No. 6 Dated: 07-06-2011} U
 {AR No. 2011-12/-14 Dated: 28/07/2011} U
 {AR No. 2011-12/-15 Dated: 28/07/2011} U

U

U

U

8. Fixation of pay in respect of Technical Assistant (Gr-1) and Agronomists under three tier pay scales

U

Higher pay scales were granted to Technical Assistants (Gr-1) and Agronomists under three tier pay scale on the analogy of Horticulture Department Officer's of Himachal Pradesh Government vide Registrar's Office Order No UHF/Rsegr/Estt-U/FTA/9.18-4/-298-317 dated 05/4/01 and UHF/Regr/Estt-U/FUA/9.08-4/318-39 dated 05/4/01. In this regard, it is noted that the Technical Assistants (Gr-1) and Agronomists are re-designated as Farm Managers vide Notification No. UFD. UFC 592/2006-4323-373 dated 07.7.06. But as per statute 2.5(4) neither the approval of the State Government has been shown to audit nor did the same has just filed as per powers vested with concerned authorities under the Act and Statute of the University. Further, the R&P rules for the re-designated post were also not put up in the audit. In reply to audit observations, it was intimated by the Director of Research that matter was under consideration of the authorities. Therefore, the pay fixation in absence of R & P rules is required to be justified as per rules and procedure. However, as these pay scales were granted by the Departmental Promotion Committee in consonance of the Board of Management decision, hence all such cases were admitted provisionally subject to the above observations and final decision in this matter.

U

{AR No 9 Dated: 04-06-2011} U

9. Re-fixation of pay in respect of some teachers on the recommendation of the Committee & clarification of the Government - observation thereof

U

In pursuance of the clarification received from the Principal Secretary (Hort) to the Government of HP vide letter no. HTC G(10)-3/2009-1 dated 06/6/01 and on the basis of the decision taken by the University Committee vide letter no. UHF/Regr/Estt-110/-246/88/01/-6835-6886 dated 00/6/01, the pay fixation cases in respect of some teachers were again put up to the audit for vetting. However, it is found that the pay fixation done in revised scale w.e.f. 1/1/06 in case of these teachers was not correct in the opinion of the committee and was corrected now. After perusal of these cases the audit was of the view/opinion that before these cases are finally vetted, the clarification from the Government needs to be sought keeping in view the following observations:

U

- (a) It is evident from the instructions issued by the Government in this regard that on fixation of the pay under the revised pay scale of the

ICAR, the rule of HP Government will apply for regulation of rate of increment, date of increment, pay fixation formula, allowances & date of retirement but the procedure on the basis of which the fixation of pay is to be done on promotion taking place between 1/1/06 to 31/08/08 from the post of Assistant Scientist (Sr Scale) to the post of Associate Scientist & from Associate Scientist to Sr Scientist/Professor is still not clear in aforesaid instructions of the Government and earlier for dealing such type of cases, the procedure laid down by the ICAR, New Delhi vide F.NO. (1/09-Per/IV91-B) dated 06/09/09 was adopted. Hence procedure to be adopted for dealing such cases of promotion needs to be got clarified from the Govt. U

- (b) According to the aforesaid instructions of the Government, the non compounded advance increments will take effect from 1/9/08 and onwards under revised pay rules, as such pay fixation of Assistant Scientists appointed from 1/9/08 onwards are being regulated accordingly but the pay fixations of Assistant Scientists appointed prior to 1/9/08 i.e. between 1/1/06 to 31/8/08, which were earlier done on the basis of the procedure laid down by the ICAR (i.e. U according to the fitment table) have again been put up to the audit U after regulating/fixing the same in accordance with the procedure laid down for newly appointed Assistant Scientists from 1/9/08 and onwards. Hence, the procedure to be adopted for fixation of the pay of Assistant Scientists appointed between 1/1/06 to 31/8/08 needs to be got clarified from the Government whether it needs to be done on the basis of the clarification of the ICAR (on fitment table basis) or as it is being done in the case of Assistant Scientists appointed from 1/9/08 onwards. U

- (c) It was also advised that payments to the scientist/teachers whose cases have already been re-fixed in the month of August 2011 on the basis of the recommendations of the committee & aforesaid instructions of the Government may also be stopped till the receipt of final clarification regarding the Government. Besides this, the recovery of the difference amount on the basis of re-fixation of pay may also be ensured from the concerned teachers to whom the payments of salary were already released in the month of August/2011, if the clarification of the Government comes out to be contrary to the recommendations of the committee U

{AR No. 2011/12/- 26 Dated: 08-09-2011} U

**10. Deletion of word Co-terminus from the Initial appointment -
observation thereof**

The University Board of Management deleted the word co-terminus from the Initial Appointment of many teachers/officials working under different projects either on the basis of the direction/clarification comprised in Government of Himachal Pradesh Horticulture Department letter No. UH/UG(U0)2/97 dated 21/5/05 or on the basis of the verdict of the Hon'ble Courts in the particular case. It is pertinent to mention here that after deletion of the word Co-terminus from the initial, the concerned teacher/official will continue to serve even after termination of the project in which he/she was appointed and subsequently his/her salary/emoluments and all other service benefits are to be borne by the University/State Government and thus the liability for emoluments and other service benefits ultimately falls on the University/State Government. It is important to bring to the notice of authorities that recruitment to all posts has been banned by the Government of Himachal Pradesh vide HP Government letter No. F(A)-U(II)-II/2004 dated 03.6.2007. New recruitments can be made only with the prior approval of the Finance Department (HP) and Council of Ministers. However, the deletion of the word "Co-terminus" from the Initial Appointment tantamount to direct recruitment to the regular post as it enables the person concerned to remain in service even after termination of the project. This is evident from perusal of the recent cases of Dr. Yas Pal Sharma (Asstt Scientist) & Mrs Chitlerka (Analyst) Department of Forest Products, which were put up in audit for vetting after the approval of the Board of Management and on the basis of instructions comprised in letter No. UH/UG(U0)2/97 of Government of HP, Department of Horticulture dated 21/5/05. Therefore, to avoid the complications which may arise in future in this regard, the University authorities are advised that a fresh clarification in the matter may be sought from the Government of Himachal Pradesh.

{AR No. 20U -12/- 31 Dated: 29/09/2011}

Engagement and further grant of extension to S U B S Rana, Secretary to the Vice Chancellor on contract basis against the post of Assistant Scientist, without the approval of funding agency

- (a) The University has engaged Sh. U B S. Rana as Secretary to the Vice Chancellor on contract basis on fixed salary of ₹20000/- per month against the post of Assistant Scientist, NAEB (Regional Centre), for a period of six months in the first instance from the date of joining, vide office order number UHF/Regr(E-II)/20U /518U-86 dated 27.05.20U . In this regard, it was observed that the Regional Centre is funded by the NAEB and the terms and conditions for the

operation/administration of Regional Centre is governed by the MOU between the NAEB and University as per Memo UHF/RC/3- 385-87 dated 22/02/2008 and as per the model administrative guidelines (NMWD/NAEB). However, in the above mentioned case, it is not shown to the audit that whether the approval of the funding agency has been obtained or not to appoint Secretary to the Vice Chancellor against the post of Assistant Scientist and the basis of fixation of his salary @ ₹20000/- P.M. has not been intimated to audit and thus it appears that the detailed procedure in this regard has not been followed.

U

- (b) Further, appointment of SUB S Rana, to the post of Secretary to the Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor (on contractual basis) has been extended for six months w.e.f. 28-11-2011 as conveyed vide Registrar Office Order No. UHF/Regr/(Estt-II) 2011/U-24945-5 dated 7/12/11. In this context, it is observed that grant of extension for this appointment is not in order as no provision/rule exists in the University Act/ Statute in respect of extension to such appointments. Hence the provisions/rules under which this extension has been granted may be put up in audit. In this case, it is noted that the Advisory Management Committee of the Regional Centre in its 40th meeting held on 24/11/11 has granted its approval for this engagement as well as simultaneously approved further six months extension of the engagement w.e.f. 28-11-2011 vide agenda item 40/6. This approval as well as extension is not appropriate as the powers/authority under which this has been granted by AMC is not clear. Therefore, the engagements of SUB S Rana as Secretary to the Hon'ble VC on contractual basis has already been questioned by the audit vide Audit Request No. 12 dated 19/07-2011 addressed to the Coordinator, Regional Center (NAEB). Thus, keep in view the irregularities pointed out in the audit request no. 12 dated 19-07-2011 as well as the points discussed above, Registrar Office was advised to refer this matter to appropriate authority for clarification. Further, the unnecessary approval of competent authority/ funding agency regarding appointment/grant of extension of SUB S Rana, may be obtained and shown to audit.

{AR No. 2011-12/- 12 Dated: 19/07/2011}
{AR No. 2011-12/- 52 Dated: 04/01/2012}

12. Appointment to the post of clerk on contract basis in the University on compassionate grounds against the policy

Shresh B Umta was appointed on compassionate grounds vide Registrar Office letter No. UHF. Regr. Rectt-2-21/2010/18494-18509. While vetting the appointment, following discrepancies were observed:-

(a) As per condition No (a) & (b) of the approval conveyed by Special Secretary (Hort.) to the Government of UHP vide letter No. UHF. Regr. Rectt. (UO)-1(2011) dated 06.09.2011, the compassionate appointment was to be given only when the person to be appointed must have annual income below ₹ 37500/- if having family of one member, ₹ 75000/- if having family of two members etc. As per service book of late Sh. Sanjeev B Umta, he has shown only one dependent i.e. Sh. Hitesh Akur (son) who is getting family pension of ₹ 7295+51% DA i.e. ₹ 1015/- PM (₹ 1,32,085 P.A.) which is above the income limit fixed by the Govt. Hence, the appointment is against the policy and approval of the Govt. The case was required to be referred back to AD/FD for appropriate orders.

(b) The detail regarding condition (U) of above referred letter i.e. the necessary record as per Government Instructions wherein it is mentioned that only up to 5% of vacancies fall under direct recruitment quota are required to be reserved for compassionate appointments, was not forthcoming which may be prepared and shown to audit. However, as this person has already been appointed and joined on 12/11/11 the appointment is admitted subject to this requisition.

{AR No. 2011/10/- 42 Dated: 30-10-2011}

13. Appointment of (Ms) Reshma as Assistant Professor (Floriculture & Landscaping) without essential qualification of NEU at the time of last date of receipt of application

Ms. Reshma was appointed as Assistant Professor (Floriculture & Landscaping) vide letter No. UHF. Regr. Rectt. U2-04/2009/-U5643-58 dated 01/09/2010. While checking her appointment, it was observed that as on 06/10/10 the last date of receipt of the application, she was not possessing required qualifications for the post of Assistant Professor in accordance with terms and conditions of the letter No. UHF. Regr. Rectt. 2-U 04/2010/-6583-6748 dated 25.10.10 (Advertisement No. 01/2010), as she was qualified under the National Eligibility Test held on 30/6/11 under Roll Number 250400000262, Sr. No. ASRB/CE/EXAM(NEU)/2010-168 and hence she was not eligible for the post as on 06/10/10 on account of not holding certificate of "National Eligibility Test". Therefore, the appointment was found irregular.

due to the reasons stated above and needs to be reviewed in accordance with the advice given by auditor in the matter vide AR No.2011-U2/- U4 and U5 dated 28.7.2011

{AR No. 2011-U2/- 43 Dated: 30-10-2011}

14. Appointment of Sh. Ganshyam Aggarwal as Assistant Professor (Agricultural Engineering) in Department of Soil Science & Water Engineering without prior sanction of the Government

Sh. Ganshyam Aggarwal was appointed as Assistant Professor (Agricultural Engineering) vide letter No. UHF/Regr.Rectt 2-04/2009/-15659-U74 dated 09.20.11. It has been observed that fresh sanction of the government for recruitment against the post was called vacant due to resignation of the former appointee was not obtained. It is pertinent to mention here that the Government of HP granted its approval for filling up of forty eligible posts of teachers in various Departments in UHF, Nauni & RHRs, Shribo & Jabot vide letter No. UHTUG(U0) U0/98 dated 09.4.07 and against one of these posts S. R. Udas Kumar was appointed and he subsequently resigned from the post on 15.01.11. Thereafter, Sh. Ganshyam Aggarwal was appointed against this vacancy vide the aforesaid appointment letter. The above referred approval of the Government of HP stands lapsed once S. R. Udas Kumar was appointed and subsequently joined on the post. His resignation from the post does not in any way authorize the University authority to make fresh appointment suo moto without taking the fresh/revised approval of the Government. Hence, the fresh appointment of Sh. Ganshyam Aggarwal needs to be regularized with the revised approval of the Government.

{AR No. 2011-U2/- 45 Dated: 03-10-2011}

15. Regarding review & regulation of the pays of employees whose pays exceeded maximum of their pay bands

It was observed that pay of some University employees exceeded the maximum of their pay bands, for example the pay of Sh. Hardev Singh (placed in the pay band of 4900-10680+1400 who is working as beldar) fixed vide letter no. UHF(Regr)Estt/8-133/187-259298-32 dated 22/11/10 as on 11/11/10 has already exceeded the maximum of the pay band and has reached upto ₹ 10760/- but no action has been taken by the University to regulate his pay in accordance with instructions contained in para no 7 (U) of the notification no FIN(PR) B(7)-U/2009 dated 26/8/09 & notification no FIN-PR)B(7)-U/2009 dated 18.01.09. This is an example of such irregularity and there are number of like cases in the University. Therefore, it is advised to issue necessary instructions in this regard to the quarters concerned to

review and regulate all such cases with the prior sanction of the competent authority in accordance with the norms/rules stipulated in the aforesaid notifications.

U

{AR No/2011-12/- 55 Dated:- 19/01/2012}

U

U

16. Regarding expenditure of Vice-Chancellor to incur expenditure amounting to ₹ 17,114/- out of different scheme

U

A scrutiny of contingent bill no. 1 of 09/2011 of Registrar's Office reveals that Stationery articles were purchased from JMD Enterprises under a rate contract for ₹ 17,114/-. Expenditure incurred on this bill was originally sanctioned by the Hon'ble VC under scheme code HPL-025-37 "Establishment of University Administration." However, by the time supply of the material was received from supplier, the funds in the said scheme were not sufficient to meet this expenditure. Hence, the revised/fresh expenditure sanction was obtained from the Registrar under scheme code HPL-129-37. Keeping in view the above position, the Registrar's Office was advised vide Audit Memo No. URS/UHF-Nauni/Memo/2011-12/-30 dated 08-10-2011 to obtain revised expenditure sanction from the Hon. VC because original sanction was accorded by him and accordingly only he can revise/modify his orders. But the Registrar Office preferred not to obtain the revised expenditure sanction and once again returned the bill for admittance in pre-audit. Therefore, it was once again advised to obtain revised expenditure sanction of the Hon'ble VC to regularize the expenditure. Further it was also advised that in case of any doubt about the point of view of the audit the matter can be referred to the Comptroller, UHF for clarifications as he is the appropriate authority in the University to opine on the financial matters. However, nothing has been done in this case. It is therefore, once again advised that the above expenditure may be got regularized with the sanction of competent authority.

U

{AR No/2011-12/- 36 Dated: 22-10-2011}

U

U

U

17. Passing of contingent temporary advance amounting to ₹ 6000/- on account of POL without the authorization of DDO

U

While scrutinizing the contingent advance bill no. 1276 of 12/2011 amounting to ₹ 6000/- which was required for the journey to be undertaken by the Registrar to Delhi in vehicle no. HP-14-3490, it was observed that the bill was prepared/passed under the sign and seal of the Registrar instead of the Drawing & Disbursing Officer of the office of the Registrar. This irregularity was pointed out under audit observation dated 05-02-2011 on the bill containing

therein that a Drawing & Disbursing Officer enjoys/exercises powers in accordance with the provisions of the H.P. Financial Rules 1971 to pass the bill further, UHP Govt. order no 7 below rule 20 of HPFR clearly states that "Disbursing Officers authorization to sign remains effective till it is withdrawn or altered". In response to this audit observation, it was requested that the bill may be admitted subject to audit request as the advance is required urgently pending clarification since HPFR rules are not applicable in the University. Hence, the said advance has been admitted in the audit provisionally subject to the following observations:

- (a) If the HPFR provisions are not applicable to the University, as stated in the bill in response to this office observation dated 15.12.2011, then the Financial Rules which regulate the University expenditure may be put up for audit for perusal so that in future all bills/expenditure of the University are regulated in accordance with the University rules instead of the HPFR and financial rules framed by the Government as is being done till now.
- (b) Clarification in this regard as assured on the bill may be sought from the Finance Department of the Government of HP at the earliest and put up for audit for perusal.
- (c) Proper orders of the competent authority authorizing the Registrar to act as Disbursing Officer of his office may also be put up for audit so that the payment so released may be regularized accordingly.

{AR No. 2011-12/- 50 Dated: 21.12.2011}

U

U

Comptroller's Office

U

18. Finalization of rate contract for the supply of "Godrej furniture and customized products without calling tenders/quotations and incurring of expenditure of ₹42,69,998/- thereof"

U

The Comptroller UH&F, Naun entered into a rate contract for supply of Godrej Brand products like furniture and customized products (Modular Labs) with M/s Godrej and Boyce Mfg. Ltd. through authorized dealer Indu Furniture, Rajgarh Road Solan. The rate contract was notified vide Comptroller's Office notification No. H/Compt.CS.4-6/93(Vol-II)/-4119 dated 23-7-10. As per rule 27(a) as contained in Part-II of the University Accounts Manual "Where work or supply of material is to be given out on rate basis contract, tenders may be invited in most open and public manner.

possible, whether by advertisement in the press or by notice in English and Hindi". But in the instant case, the rate contract was finalized by the University without calling quotations/ tenders and without observing all the procedural formalities. Some observations were expressed by audit in respect of the SRC last year also under Audit Requisition No. 52 dated 21-01-2011 but the corrective measures have not yet been initiated by the University. Since the University was understood to have undertaken many corrective measures undertaken by the Comptroller's Office, hence, on the basis of the Rate Contract, the Estate Organization of the University continuously awarded more and more works to M/s Godrej Boyce Mfg Co, Ltd although the authorized dealer M/s Indu Furniture near NCC Office, Rajgarh Road, Solan H.P.U and resultantly apart from the six works of worth ₹ 18,53,605/- already pointed out under the above referred audit requisition dated 20-01-2011, the Executive Engineer (Const) was again awarded eleven more different works worth ₹ 42,69,998/- to the said firm as detailed hereunder:-

Sl. No.	Department	Award letter No.	Amount (₹)
1.	Deptt of TGR	UHF/Const/1/Vol/3U/2010- 5824-28 dated 22.3.10	₹ 1,00,290/-
2.	Deptt of SSWM	UHF/Const/1/Vol/3U/2010- 5952-56 dated 28.3.10	₹ 3,58,264/-
3.	Deptt of EAP	UHF/Const/1/Vol/3U/2010- 504-7 dated 09.05.10	₹ 4,30,310/-
4.	Deptt of MPP	UHF/Const/1/Vol/3U/2010- 553-56 dated 00-5-10	₹ 5,80,492/-
5.	-Do-	UHF/Const/1/Vol/3U/2010- 499-503 dated 09-5-10	₹ 3,36,210/-
6.	-Do-	UHF/Const/1/Vol/3U/2010- 529-32 dated 09.5.10	₹ 6,60,107/-
7.	KVK RoUru	UHF/Const/1/Vol/3U/2010- 549-52 dated 00-5-10	₹ 1,78,810/-
8.	RHRS Barbo	UHF/Const/1/Vol/31/2010- 70-73 dated 25-4-10	₹ 4,15,650/-
9.	-Do-	UHF/Const/1/Vol/3U/2010- 332-35 dated 03-5-10	₹ 6,62,346/-

10.	JKVK Kinnaur	UHF/Const/10/Vol/3U/2010- U dated 09-5-U U	521-24	₹ 3,70,830/- U
	U Do-	UHF/Const/10/Vol/3U/2010- U dated 09-5-U U	533-36	₹ 73,678/- U
U	U	Total: U		42,69,998/- U

U

As the rate contract on question U as not been entered into after U inviting the tenders through advertisement in the press, therefore, awarding U of works worth ₹ 60,23,603/- (₹ 18,53,605/- ~~as detailed and intimated vide U AR No. 52 dated 21/01/2011~~) + ₹ 42,69,998/- as mentioned above by the Executive Engineer (Const) to M/s Godrej Boyce Mfg Co, Ltd through the regular authorized dealer M/s Indu Furniture near NCC Office, Rajgarh Road, Solan U H.P. is against the provisions of financial propriety and cannot be considered U as regular expenditure. Hence, it is again reiterated that reasons for U violating the provisions of Accounts Manual for entering into this rate U contract may be justified and regular expenditure of ₹ 60,23,603 be got U regularized with the specific approval of the competent authority/funding U agency. Besides this, immediate termination of this rate contract may also U be ensured so as to avoid any further award of such work to the supplier. U

(AR No. 20U -112/- 3 Dated: 28.5.2011}

19. Finalization of rate contract for taxi hiring rate without following proper procedure U

U

The Executive Engineer (Const) on behalf of the University entered into a Rate Contract vide letter No. UHF.Const/VeU/10/2011-183-220 with U SUR CU and SURAUU Sharma residents of Oacugat for hiring of tax for U undertaking tours/journeys on U connect on with the U business of the University. Under this RC, the rates for taxi hiring were revised upward as ₹ 850/- per kilometre of the journey along with a fixed minimum charges of ₹ 1850/- per day. After perusal of the rate contract as well as the U claim/Contingent bills prepared by the University on the basis of this RC, the following discrepancies and irregularities were observed:- U

- U
- (a) U The Comptroller (UH&F) being in-charge of the financial matters U pertaining to the University as well as according to prevalent U practice/procedure, the Comptroller Office was required to finalize the U rate contract after fulfilling the stipulated procedure/formalities with U the proper permission of the competent authority but the capacity U under which Executive Engineer (Const) entered into this rate contract U

at his own level is not understandable. So, it may be just fixed as to how this rate contract has been finalized by the Executive Engineer.

U

- (b) The rates so approved @ ₹ 8.50/- per KM + ₹ 850/- minimum charges per day are much higher than those approved by the Govt of HP which are @ ₹ 6/- per kilometer as notified by the Government vide memorandum No. UFn(c)-B(7)-14/98 dated 3/7/2005 and further adopted by the University vide notification No. UHF/Bud/2-58/98-99/5067-07 dated 7/8/2005. Thus, the award of this rate contract over and above the Govt norms needs to be justified in the light of relevant rules/provisions of the University.

❖ *the above observations were intimated to the Comptroller, UH&F under AR No 201U-12/-U6 Dated: 29/07/2011*

- (c) After issue of this letter/RC by the Executive Engineer (Const), the audit was flooded with the tax hiring bills of various University departments @ Rs. 8.50/- per kilometer along with fixed minimum charges of Rs. 850/- per day and it was very difficult for audit whether to regulate such bills according to the notification of the Govt which was also adopted by the University or as per the contract finalized by the Executive Engineer. Therefore, they were requested to justify the approval of taxi hiring rates at a rate higher than the Govt approved rates with facts and figures in relation to the provisions given in University Act and Statute but no concrete steps have been taken by them in this regard.

U

- (d) Besides above, the Executive engineer was also requested to put up the complete case along with tenders/quotations approved by the competent authority regarding approval of this contract and audit for perusal but no concrete steps have been taken by them in this regard.

U

❖ *the above observations were intimated to the Estate Officer, UH&F under AR No 201U-12/-U21 Dated: 02-08-2011*

However, after perusal of the replies to AR No 201U-12/-21 Dated 02-08-2011 submitted by Estate Office vide letter no. UHF-Const-/Veh/201U-988-U92 dated 25-08-2011 and UHF-Const-/Veh/201U-2005-09 dated 27-08-2011, it was further observed as under:-

U

- (e) The reply submitted by Estate Office was not found satisfactory due to non adherence to the laid down procedures. The rates at which the contract has been awarded by Estate Office for the class of vehicle

were U g l e r t h a n t h e r a t e s a l r e a d y n o t f i x e d . T h e E s t a t e O f f i c e r e v i s e d U t h e u p w a r d U n c o m p a r i s o n t o t h e G o v e r n m e n t n o t i f i c a t i o n t h a t t o o U w i t h o u t c o n c u r r e n c e o f t h e c o m p e t e n t a u t h o r i t y . U H e n c e , t h e c a s e U n e e d s t o b e r e v i e w e d a n d t a k e n u p w i t h U g l e r a u t h o r i t e s o f t h e U u n i v e r s i t y a s p e r t h e l a i d d o w n p r o c e d u r e s . U

- U
- (f) U It was also observed that upward revision of the tax U r n g rates on U t h e l o w e s t m a r k e t r a t e b a s e d b y c a l l i n g o f t h e q u o t a t i o n s f r o m o p e n U m a r k e t , w i t h o u t a n y p r o v i s i o n i n t h e r e g a r d i n g t h e U n i v e r s i t y A c t a n d U S t a t u t e i s c o n t r a r y t o t h e i n s t r u c t i o n s o f t h e F i n a n c e (R e g u l a t i o n) U D e p a r t m e n t , b e c a u s e a l t e r a t i o n , m o d i f i c a t i o n , r e l a x a t i o n ; r e v i s i o n e t c U o f t h e G o v e r n m e n t i n s t r u c t i o n s a n d r a t e s s o a p p r o v e d d o e s n o t f a l l i n U t h e p u r v e w o f t h e U n i v e r s i t y a u t h o r i t e s . U t h e r e f o r e , U t w a s a d v i s e d U t h a t a r b i t r a r y u p w a r d r e v i s i o n o f t h e r a t e s v i d e E s t a t e O f f i c e l e t t e r n o U U H F / C o n s t U / e h / U 0 / 2 8 / - 1 8 3 - 2 2 0 d a t e d 2 7 - 0 4 - 2 0 1 1 U o n q u o t a t i o n b a s i s U f r o m o p e n m a r k e t m a y e t h e r b e i m m e d i a t e l y w i t d r a w n o r t h e s e U r a t e s m a y b e g o t a p p r o v e d f r o m t h e G o v t . o f H P F i n a n c e (R e g u l a t i o n) U D e p a r t m e n t t h r o u g h A D a f t e r c o n c u r r e n c e o f t h e B O M U U

❖ *e above observations were intimated to the Estate Officer, UH&F under AR No U20U -112/-125 Dated: 05-09-20*

- U
- (g) U Further t h a l s o U n t i m a t e d U t a t U G o v e r n m e n t U o f U H m a c U a l U P r a d e s h , U D e p a r t m e n t o f F i n a n c e v i d e n o t i f i c a t i o n n o U U 5 4 1 / 2 0 0 9 (F i n L A) V o l - U P a r t d a t e d 2 1 - 1 0 - 2 0 1 0 U a s c i r c u l a t e d a p o l i c y r e g a r d i n g - S c h e m e f o r U o u t s o u r c i n g o f v e h i c l e s r e q u i r e m e n t s U n G o v t d e p a r t m e n t s a t D i s t r i c t U l e v e l . A s p e r t h i s s c h e m e a l l t h e D e p u t y C o m m i s s i o n e r s U n H U P a v e U b e e n a u t h o r i z e d t o d o t h e t e n d e r i n g f o r U r n i n g v e U c l e s / t a x s f o r t h e U d i f f e r e n t d e p a r t m e n t s U n t h e i r d i s t r i c t s . U t h e r e f o r e , U t s a d v i s e d t h a t U “ U n i v e r s i t y U a u t h o r i t e s s h o u l d U c o n t a c t U t h e D e p u t y U C o m m i s s i o n e r , U S o l a n f o r U r n i n g v e U c l e s / t a x i s a t t h e r a t e s f i x e d b y t h e m a n d a l s o U w i t d r a w t h e n o t i f i c a t i o n i s s u e d b y t h e m a t t h e i r o w n l e v e l f o r f i x i n g U t h e U r n i n g c h a r g e s o f t h e t a x (s) e t c U ” . U

U

- (h) U I n v i e w o f a b o v e , t h e C o m p t r o l l e r (U H & F) w a s a d v i s e d t o t a k e U n e c e s s a r y a c t i o n a c c o r d i n g t o t h e U n s t r u c t i o n s o f t h e G o v e r n m e n t t o U s e t t l e t h e i s s u e k e e p i n g i n v i e w t h e a b o v e c l a r i f i c a t i o n . U

❖ *e above observations were intimated to the Comptroller, UH&F U under AR No 2011-112/- 39 Dated: 02-11-2011U*

U

{AR No U2011-112/-116 Dated: 29/07/2011, issued to the Comptroller} U
{AR No. 2011-112/- 21 Dated: 02-08-2011, issued to the Estate Officer}

{AR No. 2011-12/- 25 Dated: 05-09-2011, issued to the Estate Officer}
{AR No. 2011-12/- 39 Dated: 02-11-2011, issued to the Comptroller}

U
20. **Revisions of pension rules for Teachers and equivalent retired before 01-01-2006 after completion of three years regular service as Assistant/Associate Professor without adoption**
U

The revised pension rules effective from 01-01-2006 were notified by the Department of Culture, Government of HP vide notification number UHTC-G(U)-3/2009 dated 27-10-2009 and further adopted by the University vide notification number UHF/Bud/U-33/(ICAR/UGC)/2009-10:11096-846 dated 01-12-2009. As per the notification, there are two pay scales for the same post of Assistant Professor/Associate Professor as applicable on 01-01-2006. The first is applicable to those with less than three years of service and other for those with more than three years of service. In the instant case, pay scales as notified by ICAR have been adopted where as the pay fixation formulae and pension rules of as notified by the HP Govt are being followed by the University. While checking the Pension revision case of SUJ P Chattrat (Retired Assistant Professor) at Note 80- 89 of the concerned file No. 2-36/92 following discrepancies were observed: U

- U
- (a) It was observed that while fixing the pay in the case of 01-01-2006, clarification given by the ICAR vide no. U (1)/09-Per(U)-3 dated 06 Oct 2009 was first implemented by the University and then withdrawn. Further, in this case also, clarification given by the M.H.R.D. to the U.G.C. cannot be considered as correct to ascertain corresponding pay scale under pension notification of HP Govt, without its adoption for this matter is clarified by the AD/HP Government.
- U
- (b) It was also pointed out that as no Central Govt/HP Govt/ICAR/UGC notification/circular/instruction etc. can be applied to the University suo moto, therefore, it is advised that the clarification request may also be got from the Govt of HP and be adopted by the University as per the laid down procedure and prevailing practice. It is also made clear to the University authorities that if the Govt of HP takes stand contrary to the above said clarification then the whole responsibility on r/o excess payment of the pension fixed by the University shall lie with the University authorities." U

U
U
{AR No. 2011-12/- 13 Dated: 19.6.2011} U

21. Regarding reimbursement of stay charges during tours in the guest houses which are not being run on commercial lines and observation thereof

The University modified the rules pertaining to reimbursement of stay charges during tours by the University officers/officers in the guest houses which are not being run on commercial lines vide Comptroller Office notification no. UHF/FC/77th meeting/2010/2011-475-525 dated 08-04-2011. In this regard, it was observed that as per instructions issued by the Government of Himachal Pradesh Finance (Regulation) Department vide office memorandum no. Fin-C-B(7)-14/98, Govt. of HP Dated 8.10.98 and further adopted by the University vide letter No. Bud-2-58/98-99-00993-U

033 Dated 06/09/99, the reimbursement of stay charges to the officers/officers during tour outside the State at prescribed rate and on the basis of the grade/category of the concerned officer/officers will only be made in case if they stay in hotels/tourist bungalows run on commercial lines and they produce the receipt in this regard. But the Board of Management in its 84th meeting held on 30/3/10, has relaxed the above norms of the Govt. as per letter No. UHF/FC/77th meeting/2010/2011-475-525 dated 18/4/10 by allowing the reimbursement of actual rent paid for stay in ICAR and CFRE run guest houses at New Delhi and other stations on production of valid receipt and restricted the entitlement of the concerned employee as per UA Rules. However, grant of relaxation does not come under the purview of Board of Management as such relaxations in rules can only be allowed after approval/consent of the Government. Therefore, it was advised that the decision of the Board of Management may be got regularized with the approval of the Government of Himachal Pradesh Finance (Regulation) Department through the Administrative Department of the University. But nothing concrete has been done by the University in this regard.

It is further added that ***"Government of Himachal Pradesh Finance (IF) Department through numerous orders/Rules/Regulations has advised Govt. Departments/PSUs/Autonomous Bodies not to violate Govt. standing orders/rules/regulations with regards to payment of UA/DA and hotel rent etc. over and above the amounts admissible under the rules. If the University (UH&F) authority still have any doubt in this regard then they are advised to seek an authoritative clarification from Finance Department through the R.A.D."*** Therefore, it was once again advised to get the matter clarified from Finance Department and direct all the University Departments to adhere strictly to the Govt. instructions in this regard.

{AR No. 2011-10/-24 Dated: 26/08/2011}
{AR No. 2011-10/-32 Dated: 08-10-2011}

22. Suspected misuse of official vehicle.

Following TUA bills were put up to audit on account of journey of U scientists from KVK's of the University of Kandaghat/Rouru/Recong Peo to U Srinagar and back to attend Zonal workshop.

Sr No	Amount	Scheme	Name of the claimant
1	31 of ₹ 11395/-	HMS-287-56	Sh. HURU Sharma BP 7750/- KVK, Kandaghat
2	72 of ₹ 12898/-	HCR-04-69	Sh. Narendra Singh Ka. 5360/- KVK Rouru
3	0 of ₹ 12327/-	HCR-04-59	Sh. M. Verma BP 8300/- KVK, Kinnour

While pre-auditing these bills, it has been noted that the claimants traveled from Kandaghat to Jammu in the official vehicle HP-U3-B-010 and from Jammu to Srinagar by a r. The official vehicle was allowed to return empty from Jammu to KVK Kandaghat because the scientists have performed the return journey from Srinagar to Chandigarh by a r. On return journey the same official vehicle was used for traveling of these scientists from Chandigarh to KVK and here also the vehicle was allowed to go to Chandigarh empty. Thus, there was no justification of using government vehicle in place of public transport and it seems to be misuse of official vehicle which is against the standing and economy instructions of the Government. It is also found from the bills that the airfare from Jammu to Srinagar is ₹1585.00 and from Srinagar to Chandigarh is ₹5350.00 and thus the excess expenditure of (5350-1585X3=₹895) has been incurred in this case. Thus, the excess expenditure incurred on account of return journey by a r from Srinagar to Chandigarh in place of Srinagar to Jammu may be justified. Further, as stated above the official vehicle was used up to Jammu for onward return empty to KVK centre, therefore, the excess vehicle/unfruitful travel by way of bringing back the empty vehicle from Jammu to Kandaghat and travel of vehicle from Kandaghat to Chandigarh may also be justified.

{AR No. 2011 12/- 46 Dated: 05-10-2011}

23. Regarding purchase of branded products/ instruments/equipments on single quotation basis and incurring of expenditure of ₹ 35426 U thereof

U
 WhUlecUeck ng thU cont ngent b U Unpre aud t,It Uas been observed U
 t Uat some of tUe departments are adopt ng pract ce of effect ng major U
 purcUases of Ustruments/equ pments on sngle quotat on basis Unstead of U
 fulfilling all tUe codal formalities and follow ngthU procedure as la ddown n
 Un vers ty Accounts ManualUSome of the recent Ustances observed Un pre U
 audit are enumerated as under: U

Sr. no.	Department	Products/ instruments/ equipments – Brand Name	Qty	Supplier	Bill No	Scheme Code	Amount
1.	Dean, College of Forestry	Ypres - MRF	4	Supreme Ypres, Katler, Bye Pass Road, Solan	332 of 03/10	ICA-012-06	24400
2.	Student Welfare Office	Refrigerator - Godrej	1	M/s Main Electron s, Solan	52 of 03/10	Student Fund A/c	27900
3.	Silviculture & Agroforestry	Digital Cameras - Sony CyberShot	2	Mehra Agencies, Solan	294 of 01/10	ICA-02-06	29980
4.	RHRS Bajaura	Refrigerator - LG	1	Arun Enterprise, Buntar, Kullu	582 of 2/12	HCR-51-53	29600
5.	HRRS Dhulakuna	Refrigerator - Samsung	1	M/s Usha Agencies, Paonta Sub, Sirmaur	360 of 03/10	HMS 263-55	21900
6.	-do-	Air-Conditioner -	1	-do-	-do-	-do-	26500

		Samsung U					
7. U	Forest U Product U	HPLC Spares U - U No U brand U mentioned U	4 U	Waters U (Ind a) U Private U Lim ted, U Banglore/U Chandigar U U	440 of U 03/10 U 22 U	UICA 058-U 22 U	86866 U
8. U	Entomol U ogy U & U Ap cultur U e U	Spl tU A r U Condit oner U with U Accessories - U Voltas U	2 U	M/s U Revolution U s, U Pras U Complex U Solan U	964 of U 03/10 U 52-07 U	UHGI U 52-07 U	81880 U
9. U	-do- U	Geyser- U Bajaj U	U	Mathura U Electron s U , Solan U	902 of U 03/10 U 59-07 U	UHCR U 59-07 U	59000 U 0 U
0 U	Mycolog U y & Plant U Pat U olog U y U	Water U purifier U - U Kent U	U	-do- U	827 of U 03/10 U 217-04 U	UHMS-U 217-04 U	6500 U
U	U	U	U	U	U	Total U	350426 U

U

In tUs regard, itUls mentioned Uere tLat tL Chapter 08 of tL
Un vers ty UAccounts UManual Uelaborates U n U deta l U the U procedure/codal U
formal tes to be followed w ile effect ng tUe purcUase of store and stock for U
t e off c al use in tUe Un vers ty U e rules conta ned in tUs cUapter requ re U
tUat first route to be followed for effect ng purcUases is that of Rate Contract U
w etUer entered nto by tUe Un vers ty or DGS&D or Controller of Stores-HPU U
If tUe Utem Uls not available on any of tUe RC tUen througU limited tenders U
(quotations) or open tenders tUrough Press. PurcUase can be effected under U
most emergent cases tUrough standing spot purcUase comm ttee alsoUAs U
far as purcUase on sngle quotat on bas s isU concerned, prov s ons as la d U
down Un the Rule 28.1(g) of tUe University Accounts Manual states tUat U
purcUase can be effected accord ng to f nanc al powers on sngle tender U
system U e. by Ubtaining U tenders U from U one f rm Un case U of U articles U of U
propriety nature are ava lable from one source only and such purcUase can U
be effected after obta ning a certifcate from tUe manufacturer or sole U
agents tUat tUe rates quoted by tUem are ident cal to tUose approved by tUe U
D rector General of Suppl es and Disposals or tUe rate tUat tUey would quote U

to other organizations or to any other State Governments. These rules are fair, just, self explanatory and above all sufficient to make all the transactions transparent. From perusal of the rules, it is quite evident that the spirit behind laying down such elaborate procedure was that "the route of effecting purchase on single quotation basis should invariably be adopted only in exceptional circumstances." But it has been observed that none of the conditions as laid down in rule 28.1 (g) of the Account Manual are being followed. Instead products of a specific brand are preferred by the requiring officer without going into detailed technical specifications of the requirement. No justification for preferring a specific brand is given. From perusal of the articles enumerated above, it appears that none of the product falls in the category of proprietary nature which could justify purchase on "single quotation basis". Digital cameras, refrigerators, air conditioners and geysers are manufactured/sold by numerous manufacturers/agents. In India therefore, the proper procedure of calling quotations specifying technical details of the product been followed before effecting purchases. Hence the university would certainly have benefited from competitive rates in the market. Therefore, keeping in view the facts stated above, audit considers all the purchases amounting to ₹310526/- as detailed above as irregular and effected without fulfilling all the codal formalities and against the essence of provisions as laid down in the University Accounts Manual, which may be justified and regularized with the approval of competent authority. Besides above, it was also advised that the practice of purchasing products of a specific brand under the garb of "proprietary article on single quotation basis" should be immediately stopped. Therefore, authority was requested to issue necessary instructions and guidelines to all the quarters concerned at the earliest.

{AR No/2011-12/- 74 Dated:- 31/03/2012}

Estate Office

24 Regarding non collection of quotations for preparing rate analysis for Non Scheduled items executed as extra/substitute items

During checking of various Works Bills put up for pre-audit, it was observed that the Estate Office has not invited/collected quotations for preparing the analysis of rates of Non-scheduled extra/substitute items executed in different works. According to Rule 25.9(i) of the CPWD Manual, "For analysis and sanction of the rates for extra/substitute non scheduled items, proper quotations should be submitted in support of the market rates" by EE/SE before seeking approval of such rates. Instead of complying with the provisions of the rule 25.9 of the CPWD Manual, the rates of non scheduled extra/substitute items, are worked out/analysed by the Estate Office on the basis of a certificate of genuineness of the market

rates" as recorded by AE/JE, which cannot be relied upon in absence of vouchers and quotations in support of the market rates, as required under the above rule. This is a serious lapse which had been pointed out by audit in many times earlier also but the required compliance was not forthcoming. Therefore, it was advised that in future compliance to the Rule 25.9 of the CPWD Manual may invariably be ensured.

U
{AR No. 2011/12/-U Dated: 31/05/2011} U

U
U
**25. C/o field laboratory for the Deptt of Silviculture & Agro forestry -U
4th and final bill amounting to Rs. 252978/-U**

U
The Work regarding C/o field laboratory for the Deptt of Silviculture & Agro Forestry was awarded to M/s Pradeep Garg on 0-10-2008 for ₹ 10,96,433/- under agreement no. 60 of 2008-09. While checking the 4th U and final bill of the work in pre audit, the following discrepancies were observed:- U

U
(a) As per condition no 3 stipulated in the award letter, water connection was to be provided by the contractor and charges thereof were to be deducted from the bill at commercial rates but water charges have not been deducted/recovered from the contractor despite audit observations dated 27/5/2011 and 28/5/2011. It was intimated that the reasons that contractor has made his own arrangement. However, no such documents/proof were made available to audit in support of his contention. Therefore as per clause B1(1) of the contract agreement a sum of ₹ 15726/- may now be recovered from the contractor/official at fault and deposited in the contractor's account under intimation to audit. U

U
(b) As per Assistant Engineer (Electrical) letter No UHF/AE(Elect)4/20U -U 424-25 dated 2U-3-U , the contractor has stolen electricity frequently by laying an illegal electrical connection from the nearby POLYHOUSE without any permission/intimation to the department. His electricity was used for laying wall tiles, flooring and all kind of welding works in the building being constructed by the contractor. This theft was stated to have been continued for three months prior to the day when it was detected by AE (Electrical). For this theft, an amount of ₹ 2720/- has been recovered from the contractor vide draft No U32 dated 28U32011. The office asked to clarify/justify the basis on which the quantum of electricity stolen has been worked out to the extent of 4 KW but no satisfactory reply to this query was submitted to the audit. As such in absence of any supporting documentary evidence, the genuineness of U

the recovery on account of stolen University electricity could not be verified/relied upon.

U

- (c) The above work was awarded to the contractor for ₹ 10,96,433/- vide letter No Const-1 Vol-3U/UHF/2007/-3736-42 dated 00/00/08 with the condition that it will be completed within 6 months to be reckoned after 5th day from the date of issue of the award letter. As per stipulated conditions the work was to be completed before 25/3/2009 but actually has been completed on 04.2.2011 and thus the contractor took extra time of one year 10 months for completion. According to the relevant clauses of the agreement, the contractor was to be penalized for delay in completion of the work, therefore, the department has imposed a penalty of ₹ 10,96,433/- @ 10% of the work done. But in the opinion of the audit imposition of ₹ 10,96,433/- for such a long delay in completion of work is not justified and sufficient because while recommending the extension of time, the concerned Assistant Engineer has pointed out time and again that reasons submitted by the contractor for extension of time for work completion are not valid. As such the same needs to be reviewed/justified after calculating the penalty strictly in accordance with norms as stipulated in relevant clauses of the contract agreement and before the release of final dues of contractor. The imposition of such a heavy penalty is not only resulting loss to the University exchequer but also encouraging the contractors to remain carefree from the aspect of time bound completion of work and hampering the pace of adjustment of advances drawn for the construction of infrastructure in the University.

U

{AR No. 5 Dated: 03-06-2011} U

U

26. Short Assessment of pooled standard license fee in respect of temporarily accommodated to six University teachers in the International Students Hostel

U

Pooled Standard license fee in respect of residential accommodation allotted to six teachers in International Student's Hostel was worked out as ₹ 1050/- per month w.e.f. 05.2011 as per Notification No. UHF/EO/24/86-U 683-724 dated 06.6.2007 of the Estate Officer. The calculation of License Fee does not seem to be in order because the Government had decided to reverse the pooled standard license fee @ ₹ 284/- per month vide office memorandum No. GAD-D-3(C) U4-2/97 dated 21st September 2010 read with S.R 317 for area up to 59.5 Sq meter. Therefore, this calculation of license fee appears to be short assessed by of ₹ 234/- per month in each case which has resulted financial loss of ₹ 404/- = (₹ 6 x ₹ 234) per month to the U

University expenditure. Hence, the Estate Office was asked to justify the calculation of license fee or else to review the same accordingly. U

U
{AR No. 2011-12/- 20 Dated: 02-08-2011}

U
U
27. Regarding purchase of furniture from M/s Godrej Boyce Mfg. Company Ltd for ₹ 1,34,19/-

U
The bill no. 2294 dated 25/05/2011 of the M/s Indu Furniture near NCC Office, Rajgarh Road, Solan H.P. for supply of furniture (2 number of three seater chairs of Godrej make) amounting to ₹ 1,34,19/- to be installed into the University Health Centre was put for pre audit. The bill was entered into the MB no. U209 at page 93. The work was technically sanctioned vide estimate no. U20 of the year 2010-11 and administrative approval was conveyed vide the Comptroller's office letter no. BudUCA-001-36/2010-11/18776-78 dated 31-03-2011. This purchase has been effected on Rate contract basis entered into by the University with M/s Godrej & Boyce Mfg. Co. Ltd. The Comptroller's office notification No. HF/Compt.CS.4-6/93(Vol-II)/-4119 dated 23-7-10. It was found that the procedure as prescribed in Accounts Manual has not been followed in this case because only such items can be purchased on single quotation basis which are of proprietary items by nature. As furniture is not a item of proprietary nature, hence these items were required to be purchased from the Govt. approved sources as per rule 28.1(g) of the Accounts Manual or after inviting tenders/quotations from the firms to enjoy the benefit of competitive market rates. Had the purchase been effected on tender/quotation basis then it would have been more beneficial to the University. Besides this, the furniture items so purchased are being very costly and fall under luxury category and purchase of luxury items is not justified as it is against the spirit of standards of financial propriety as well as provision of economy instructions, issued by the Govt. from time to time. Thus, the reasons for violation of the Govt. instructions may be justified. U

U

U
{AR NO. 2011-12/- 30 Dated: 28/09/2011}

U
28. Renovation of laboratory in H-Block of COH for the Department of Business Management at main campus Nauni- (SH-Providing EI)

U
The work Renovation of Laboratory in H-Block of COH for the Department of Business Management at main campus Nauni- (SH-Providing EI) was awarded on 29-06-2011 for ₹ 2,07,630/- to M/s Sanjay Electrical & Hardware Store, Meerut, Distt. Hamirpur vide agreement no. 42 of 2011-12. The amount allowed for this work was two months. The total work was executed for ₹ 2,02,206/- as per MB no. U202 page 79-80. While checking the Ust and final U

bill of the work. In pre audit, it has been observed that as per Estimate No. U 44 for the year 2010-11 in r/o to work a lump sum provision of ₹ 1,00,000/- was provided for "Sub Head Prov d ng of Electr al Uninstallat ons" and accordingly technically sanctioned and administrative approval was accorded by the competent authorities. But when the working estimate for the sub head was prepared on 28-04-2011, it was enhanced to ₹ 2,24,000/- which was 24% more than the original lump sum estimate. As the additional funds required to meet the expenditure are diverted from the savings from the Sub Head- Civil Work, therefore, the revised estimate for Sub Head- Prov d ng of Electr al Installations amounting to ₹ 2,24,000/- is required to be got administratively approved from the competent authority. This point was raised on the face of the bill vide the office observation dated 25-10-2011 but the reply to said observation has not been found satisfactory and revised administrative approval in r/o Sub Head- Prov d ng of Electr al Installations amounting to ₹ 2,24,000/- has not been put up in audit.

U

{AR No. 2011/10/- 41 Dated: 08/ 1/2011}

U

U

U

29. C/o Schedule Tribes Girls Hostel at Dr Y S Parmar University of Horticulture and Forestry, Nauni, Solan (SH: Building Portion) – non incorporation of amended provisions of clause U Occ in the agreement U

U

The Work construction of Schedule Tribes Girls Hostel at Dr Y S Parmar University of Horticulture and Forestry, Nauni, Solan (SH: Building Portion) was awarded vide award letter no. UHF/Const/VI.31/2010-1360-66 U Dated 2-07-2010 for ₹89,37,626/- to S D K Jan contractor under agreement no 32 of 2010-U. The amount allowed for this work was 2 months. Total work done till the 5th running bill was ₹48,49,388/- While checking the 5th running bill of the work in pre audit, it was observed that due to non incorporation of the amended provisions in the agreement in r/o Clause U0 (CC) of the agreement, an avoidable payment of ₹78131/- or ₹2507/- on account of price escalation in cost of material and ₹5304/- on account of price escalation in cost of labour till 5th running bill has resulted to the University. It is pertinent to mention here that while amending the provisions contained in para 32B, 32C and 32D of CPWD Works Manual 2007, the Director General, Central Public Works Department vide office memorandum no. UDGW/MAN/167 dated 01-02-2008 has modified the provisions of Clause U0 (CC) of forms no. CPWD 7 & 8. According to amended provisions "Clause U0 (CC) will be applicable in contracts where the stipulated period for completion is MORE THAN 18 MONTHS" Thus, as U

per provisions contained in this office memorandum these amended provisions were required to be incorporated in all the new contracts entered into after issue of these instructions because the above referred work was awarded on 02-07-2010 i.e. after issue of these amendments hence the same were required to be incorporated in the agreement. Since the Director General, CPWD is the apex authority in India to make and amend the rules relating to execution of public works hence instructions were required to have been complied with because they are also in favour of the executing agency i.e. the University. Thus, the contention of the University that HPPWD has not adopted these instructions does not seem to be correct, as it has been pleaded in response to the office and observation dated 09-12-2011 on the back of the bill. Therefore, on insertion of amendment in agreement it was put to the University to avoidable loss and matter needs to be referred to and bill to be like cases be reviewed accordingly. Further, recovery of regular payment of ₹ 7813/- may also be ensured from appropriate source.

U

{AR No/2011-12/- 53 Dated: 02-01-2012}

U
U
U

Dean, College of Forestry Office

U

30. Replacement of fiber-cable amounting to ₹ 6970/- which was damaged by JVC machine

U

Contingent Bill No. 2 of 26/8/11 for ₹ 6970/- in account of replacement of fiber-cable etc was put up for pre audit. In this bill, it was noticed that the fibre cable installed by the University was actually damaged/damaged by the JVC machine while it was levelling the land. As a result, it caused a loss to the University equivalent to the tune of ₹ 6970/- As per rule 242 of University Accounts Manual, loss of money or stores etc occurred due to negligence was required to be reported and proper procedure was to be followed and accordingly steps were to be taken to recover the money from the appropriate sources. But nothing seems to have been done in accordance with these rules and instead the Dean COF preferred to replace/repair the damaged cable from the University exchequer. Therefore, the matter is required to be referred to and loss so suffered be made good from the appropriate source.

U

{AR No/2011-12/- 34 Dated: 21-10-2011}

U

31. Incurring of expenditure of ₹ 99900/- on repair of University ambassador car from the scheme of student study tour.

U

While pre auditing the adjustment bill no 270 of 03/2012, it has been noted that at the University Ambassador Bar No UHP-U3-0066 was got repaired for ₹99900/- by drawing a contingent advance and expenditure were incurred from the scheme ICA-U3-0066 (Student Study Tour) by the office of Dean College of Forestry. As this vehicle does not pertain to the scheme, hence, this expenditure is not a financial charge on the scheme despite the fact the vehicle has been attached to the Dean College of Forestry. Keeping the aforesaid discrepancies, this expenditure may be justified besides getting the same regularized by obtaining the specific approval of the funding agency.

U

{AR No ~~2011-12~~/ 67 Dated: 31/03/2012} U

U

Office of SNS Library U

U

32. Regarding bills pertaining to the subscription of the journals

U It was intimated by the department vide letter No UHF/2068 dated 23/1/12 addressed to the Comptroller Office which was further endorsed to the office that the concerned bill may be admitted but the opinion of the audit that the bills unquestionably involve advance payment to the firms and same should have been got passed as advance from the inspection cell of the University after following the prescribed procedure for withdrawal of advances according to distribution of the audit work by the Government. The same would have also resulted in adherence to the procedure/norms as laid down in para 25.2 of the Accounts Manual. However to mitigate the hardship to the University work, the audit is admitting the bills subject to the production of receipts from the concerned firms to whom these payments are being released and subject to fulfillment of prescribed procedure as laid down in para 25.2 of the Accounts Manual. In future such advance bills may be got passed from the internal inspection cell of the University according to distribution of work. Notification no FIN(LA)H(2) c U (U5) XIV-U06/87 Vol IV dated 31.04 of Govt of HP(LAD).

U

Sr No U	Bill No & Month U	Amount U
U	91 of U/2012 U	2400/- U
2UU	92 of U/2012 U	4000/- U
3UU	93 of U/2012 U	4900/- U
4UU	94 of U/2012 U	2072/- U
5 U	95 of U/2012 U	5000/- U

6UU	96 of U/2012 U	500/- U
7UU	97 of U/2012 U	500/- U
8UU	98 of U/2012 U	500/- U
9UU	99 of U/2012 U	2500/- U
0. U	200 of U/2012 U	5000/- U
U	201 of U/2012 U	2250/- U
2. U	202 of U/2012 U	200/- U
3. U	203 of U/2012 U	2500/- U
4. U	204 of U/2012 U	4400/- U
5. U	205 of U/2012 U	3000/- U
6. U	206 of U/2012 U	4000/- U
7 U	207 of U/2012 U	500/- U
8. U	208 of U/2012 U	2000/- U
9 U	209 of U/2012 U	2000/- U
20 U	210 of U/2012 U	200/- U
2U U	211 of U/2012 U	2000/- U
22. U	212 of U/2012 U	3600/- U
23 U	213 of U/2012 U	568/- U
24 U	214 of U/2012 U	2875/- U
25 U	221 of U/2012 U	260/- U
26 U	258 of 2/2012 U	4500/- U
27 U	259 of 2/2012 U	650/- U
28 U	262 of 2/2012 U	2095/- U
29 U	280 of 3/2012 U	3000/- U
30 U	324 of 3/2012 U	30402/- U
3U U	330 of 3/2012 U	500/- U

{AR No. 201U-10/- 59(i) dated 30-1-2012} U

U

U

U

Students Welfare Office

33. Purchase of Godrej Double Door refrigerator amounting to ₹ 22,220/- on single quotation basis without inviting quotations

While checking the contingent bill no. 240 of 9.5.2011 amounting to ₹ 22,220/- on account of purchase of Godrej Double Door refrigerator from M/s Neelama Furniture and Electronics Pvt. Ltd on single quotation basis, it was found that the procedure as prescribed in the Accounts Manual has not been followed. As per Accounts Manual Rule 28(g) only such items can be purchased on single quotation basis which are of proprietary nature. As refrigerator is not a proprietary item hence, its purchase was required to be made after collecting the quotations from other such firms to enjoy the benefit of competitive market rates. Had the purchase been affected on quotation basis then it would definitely have been more beneficial to the University exchequer. Therefore, the purchase of refrigerator on single quotation basis may please be justified and regularized accordingly with the sanction of the competent authority.

{AR No. 2011/10/- Dated: 20/05/2011}

34. Purchase of furniture amounting to ₹ 5,61,886/- on single quotation basis without inviting quotations

While checking the contingent bill No. 2 of 7/2011, it was found that the furniture costing ₹ 5,61,886/- (as per details given below) was purchased by the SWO from M/s Indu Furniture, near NCC office, Rajgarh Road, Solan- an Authorized Dealer of Godrej & Boyce Mfg Co. Ltd.

Sr. No.	Qty	Particulars	Amount
1.	2 Nos	Godrej Coffee Table Office	8452-00
2.	4 Nos	Godrej 2 seater R.O. Sofa set	57548-00
3.	4 Nos	Godrej 3 seater R.O. Sofa set	73808-00
			,49,808-00
		D. discount 5%	7490-40

U	U	U	,42317-60 U
U	U	VAU 13.75%	U 9568-67 U
U	U	Total	Say ₹ U 1,61886-00 U

U
In tUs b ll, itUisU found tUat tUe procedure as prescr bed inU Accounts U Manual hUs not been followed in tUs case TU's purchUse was requ red to be U effected from tUe Govt approved sources as prov ded in tUe Rule 28U (g) of U tUe Univers ty Accounts ManualU U s rule provides tUat only such tems can U be purchUsed on sngle quotat on bas s w c U are of propr etary nature U Furn ture U s not a propr etary item, Uence, U was requ red to be purchUsed U after hvt ng tender/quotations to enjoy tUe benef t of complet ve market U rate Had tUe purchUse been effected on tender/quotat on bas s tUat itUU would definitely Uave been more benef cial to tUe University excUequer. U FurtUer, tUe furn ture items so purchUsed beng are very costly and fall U under luxurious item category, w ereas tUe purchUse of luxury tems s not U justified out of tUe student fund, as U U against tUe spirit of standards of U financ a propr etary as well as prov sion of economy Ustruct ons Ussued by U Government from tme to tme T Uerefore, tUe reasons for v olat ng tUe U GovtU Ustruct ons Uregarding UpurchUse Uof Ufurniture Uw tUout U nvit ng U quotat ons may please be just fied and regular zed accord ngly w t U t Ue U sanction of thU competent authU r tyU U

{AR No. (2011U12/- 22) Dated: } U

U
Regional Centre, National Afforestation and Eco BoardU

U 35. Engagement U ofU contractualU laboU rersU witUout U sanction/administrative approval of tUe competentU authorityU

U U e Regional Centre engaged contractual labour and submitted U tUe bills of tUeir wages under cont ngent b ll no. 384 of U0/201U for ₹7080/- U from schUme code FMS-025-41 and bill no. 389 of U0/2011 for ₹8760/- from U scUeme code FGI-003-41. WUle pre-aud tng tUese b lls,U was observed U tUat tUe sanct on/administrative approval of thU competent autUor ty Ue. U Hon'ble V ce-CUancellor as requ red under S.N 28 of thU delegation of tUe U financ a powers not fied v de Not fiat on No Bud FC/68M/Meeting /2008-U 3699-749 dated U8 7U08 was not been obta ned. U e aforesa d tUe regularity U was po nt ed out on the b lls but tUe Reg onal Centre preferred not obtain tUe U expend ture sanction and again returned thU bill for adm ttance on tUe basis U

with the plea that engagement were made under the project. But on the opinion of the audit procedure adopted is not in order. In this case, the sanction of the Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor could have been obtained as engagements were made under the schemes but not any concrete has been done in this case. It is, therefore, once again advised that necessary approval of the competent authority may be obtained in the instant case to regularize the engagement of contractual labourers.

U

{AR No/2011-10/- 38 Dated: 29-10-2011 }U

U

U

36. Appointment of Smt Jagdish Ram Thakur to the post of Field Investigator purely temporary and contractual basis for six months against the University rules

U

It has been intimated by the audit vide audit report no. 2009/10-U 86 dated 25-02-2010 to Regional Centre NAEB that the appointment of Smt Jagdish Ram Thakur (Field Investigator appointed on contractual basis) whose age was more than 45 years at the time of engagement was irregular as the appointee should have been within the age limit of 45 and 45 years as per University rules which apply to the Regional Centre also as per the administrative guidelines of the Government of India issued in this regard. According to these guidelines mode of appointment to Regional Centre (Unit) shall be the same as that of the University in which the Regional Centre (Unit) is established. However, the AMC in its meeting held on 9/6/11 has approved the engagement of Smt Jagdish Ram Thakur (Field Investigator appointed on contractual basis) whose age was more than 45 years at the time of engagement. In reply to objection raised in this regard, it was intimated to audit under RC-NAEB letters no. UHF/RC-NAEB/303-1455 dated 06-10-11 and no. UHF/RC-NAEB/B-3/2193-94 dated 15-12-10 that the Advisory Management Committee (AMC) of the Regional Centre-NAEB in its 40th meeting held on 24-11-2010 vide item no. 40/2 has approved the "*enhancement of contractual and temporary staff beyond the age of 45 years at the time of engagement and committee has also condoned the age bar of 45 years for engagement in case of Shri Jagdish Thakur and further decided that there will be no upper age bar/limit for engaging personnel on contractual basis in the centre but the person should be fit and suitable to perform the assigned job*". Its approval was given on the grounds that the appointment was on contractual basis and for limited period.

U

However, in view of position enumerated above, it is clear that the appointment so made and regularized by the AMC of the Regional Centre is irregular as per rules of the University and Government of Maharashtra Pradesh because the AMC is not empowered to supersede the rules framed

by the Government/ University and thus AMC cannot take such decisions or frame provisions/rules which are in contravention of the rules/regulations framed by the Government/University. Therefore, RC-NAEB was advised to deal the matter in accordance with the relevant rules and regulations. No case of any doubt seeks clarification from the competent authority/ Government.

U

{AR No. 201U-02/- 57 Dated: 31/00/2002} U

U

37. **Regarding irregularities in appointments undertaken under NAEB scheme (FGI-003-41)**

U

Regional Centre - National Afforestation and Eco-development Board (RC – NAEB) made appointments on various posts under the NAEB scheme (FGI-003-41) & Water Sited Development Programme (FMS-025-41) on the basis of its advertisements. Letter No. UHF/RC/NAEB/1-7/1091-1U40 dated 29.9. Dur ing vetting of these appointments following irregularities in violation of these instructions were observed:-

U

(a) It is evident that qualification of SUG L Huddanil MA (Economics) doesn't match with any of the required qualifications for the post of that Research Associate as advertised under Serial No. 1 of the advertisement letter. So appointment done doesn't seem to be justified.

U

(b) Four posts of data collector were approved by the Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor vide letter no. UHF/RC-NAEB/1-7/1081 dated 24.9 for making appointment of the regional center under scheme FGI-003-4U & later on one more post of data collector was approved by the Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor on dated 7.10.1 vide letter no. UHF/RC-NAEB/1-7/1272 dated 9.10 but it is not clear that the approval has been given under scheme FGI-003-41 or under FMS-025-4U which needs to be clarified.

U

(c) Besides, as mentioned in the preceding para(s), according to the norms stipulated under para (3) (C & d) of the administrative guidelines issued by the ministry of environment and forests of Govt. of India vide letter no. MMWD: 32-U3/89-MM.V dated 27.10.1989, the mode of recruitment and service conditions of the staff employed in the Regional Unit shall be the same as those of the institute/University. In view of the regional unit is established. In the instant case, the upper age limit for appointing a person on the post of Research Associate is 40 years for males with relaxation of the same in the case of

of SC, ST & OBC candidates as per norms of Government of India, according to the endorsement no. UHFUR/Rectt 2-26/2004/-2365-U 2341B dated 1/10/05 of the office of Registrar, whereas the norms have not been adhered to in case of Dr. Dinesh Sharma & Sushil Huddan appointed on the post of the Research Associates as their date of birth is 31/02/1970 & 3/5/1963 were respectively. Even age of Sh. J. L. Huddan and Sh. Jagdish Akur (DOB- 12/02/1963) appointed as Research Associate and Field Investigator-1 respectively have exceeded 45 years which is also against the norms of Govt. of HP duly adopted by the University according to which for contractual appointments the age limit range is from 18 to 45 years, which are usually followed by the University for undertaking contractual appointments. Hence, norms regarding age limits have completely been ignored while undertaking these above mentioned appointments.

Therefore, it was advised that above mentioned irregularities may be regularized with the approval of the competent authority and in future strict adherence to the relevant norms/rules for the purpose of undertaking appointments may be ensured.

{AR No. 20U -12/- 61 Dated:- 29-02-2012}

U

U
U

Department of Entomology & Apiculture

U

38. Regarding payment of consultation fee, to & from travel charges and stay charges payable to Dr. Abhay Ekbote, Consultant.

U

Payment of consultation fee, to & from travel charges and stay charges etc. of Dr. Abhay Ekbote, Consultant for consultancy in case of NABL Accreditation of Pesticide Residue Laboratory of the department were put up for pre-audit decontingent bill no. 002 of 06/2011 for ₹27861/- and bill no. 029 of 06/2011 for ₹ 50000/- In the instance case, while checking/scrutiny of related record of tenders etc. finalized with the consultants, it has been noticed that the proper procedure has not been adopted in the case and the following discrepancies were observed:-

U

- (a) Bank drafts pertaining to the tender fee submitted by the tendering firms/individuals were required to be credited to the University excise account. But these drafts have not been credited so far and the same was found still lying with the original tenders/ tender

comparative statement, which is a very serious lapse and needs to be justified and necessary corrective measures be taken on priority basis. U

- (b) Bank drafts submitted by the tendering firms/individuals in U r/o U REFUNDABLE SECURITY were also lying with the original tenders. U these drafts were also required to be credited to the University U account and proper U SECURITY REGISTER being maintained in U accordance with the University U Accounts U Manual U U s refundable U security is a liability of the University and complete record in this regard is required to be maintained. In this regard also appropriate U corrective measures may be ensured at the earliest under intimation U to this office U U
- (c) As per the tender of the selected consultant, to & fro travel and stay U charges are payable to U Dr U Abhay U Ekbote, U Consultant U for U NABL U Accreditation of Pesticide Residue Laboratory, as well as to U s Pune U based officials. But the extent of expenditure and entitlement of such U charges has not been specified with detailed particulars either in the U tender or the work allotment letter. U erefore, it was advised that U these payments (to & fro travel and stay U charges) may be got U regularized from the competent authority by way of specific sanction U for reimbursement on actual basis. U

{AR No. 2011/12/-100 Dated: 29-07-2011}

39. Regarding hiring of tax at a rate other than the Govt. rate

The Department hired tax for project work and contingent bill no 189 U of 06/2011 for ₹7622/-, Bill No 40 of 07/20 U for ₹ 5553/- and bill no 173 U of 07/20 U for ₹ 5757/- on account of tax charges etc were put up to audit U for pre-audit. It was observed that the tax was hired on the rates approved U by the University U vide U Executive U Engineer U (Const.) U office letter no. UHF Const/Veh/10/201 U/- U 83-220 U dated U 27/4/201 U U and the rates so U approved by the Executive Engineer (Const.) didn't seem to be in order as it had been awarded at a higher rate than that of the Govt. of HP rates duly U adopted by the University vide letter no U UHF/Bud/2-58/98-99-5067-07 dated U 7-08-2005. U erefore, it is advised that above expenditure may be got U recovered or got regularized with sanction of competent authority after U seeking necessary clarification from the Government. U

{AR No. 2011/12/- 109 Dated: 30/07/2011}

40. Purchase of Bee-Keeping Equipments without following the prescribed procedure of inviting quotations

While pre-auditing the bill Contingent bill No. 422 dated 01/01/2011 on account of purchase of Bee-Keeping equipments, it was observed that as per comparative statement competitive rates were received from three firms namely (I) Uwana Bee Farm, Gurgaon Road, Durgam Chattri, Ludhiana (Pb) U phone: 01628-259553, Mobile No. 98140-32440 (II) SUGanesh Madhukar, UGT Road Durgam Chattri, Ludhiana- and (III) Apitec & Agro Engineers Gurgaon Road Ludhiana, UP phone No. 01628-259553, Mobile No. 9850-36440. All these quotations were posted at the same time and date as per following detail and land line numbers of firms at S.No. U & 3 were also found same i.e. 01628-259553.

Sr. No.	Speed post No.	Date and time of posting
1) U	EP77565848-91N U	5/4/11 10.43 Am U
2) U	EP 77565847-51N U	5/4/11 10.42 Am U
3) U	EP 77565849-21N U	5/4/11 10.43 Am U

From the facts stated above, it seems that all these quotations were supplied by single firm in three different names of sister concerns and thus the purpose of inviting competitive rates as prescribed in para 28(c) and 28.4(b) of University Accounts Manual is defeated and purchase so effected becomes irregular/against the prescribed procedures as referred above. The above observations were reported but the audit memo No. UB7 dated 2/11/2011 but no clarification/justification regarding the same was received from the deptt. and the reply given by the deptt. was not relevant and unsatisfactory. Hence, the purchase may be regularized from the competent authority and be shown to audit.

{AR No. 2011-12/-49 Dated: 04.12.2011}

Department of Soil Science & Water Management

41. Purchase of LDPE Pond Lining Sheet amounting to ₹ 8,85,938/- without calling tenders

During pre-audit of the bill it was observed that 3000 Kgs of LDPE Pond Lining Sheet @ ₹ 187.50 per kg and 1500 Kgs of LDPE Mulch Film @ ₹

187.50 per Kg was purchased for ₹885938/- from M/s Swastik Enterprises Solan vide bill No. 333 dated 2/12/2011. The purchase has been effected in violation of instruction no. 12 of notification no. Bud FC/68th /meeting/2008-09-3699-749 dated 8.07.2008 pertaining to delegation of financial powers. In instant case although tenders were invited during Feb, 2011 but due to non response from the firms, the purchase was effected on lowest quotations basis with the approval of CPC. However, no efforts have been made to invite fresh tenders. Therefore, had fresh tenders been received by following proper procedure then there could have been some response from the suppliers/manufacturers. Hence, the irregularity may be regularized with the approval of the competent authority. Moreover, the purchase has been effected under the held up infrastructure /equipment for which ₹ 32 Lacs (Rs.25 Lacs in 1st year and Rs 7 Lacs in 2nd year) were provided but the allocation of above expenditure amounting to be ₹8,85,938/- under this head could not be ascertained due to improper maintenance of the record. Therefore, it was advised that the expenditure record for this project may be maintained properly in accordance with the rules and prevailing norms and the same should be put up in the audit for verification.

{AR No. 2011-12/- 56 Dated:- 21/01/2012}

42. Regarding irregular payment of consultancy fee of ₹ 70,850/- to University employees

During pre-audit of bill no. 89 dated 6/11/11, it has been noticed that consultancy fees amounting to ₹ 70,850/- has been released to the following University scientists who worked under the project titled "monitoring and evaluation of study in the saturated and unsaturated micro-watersheds of HP under RVP&FPR".

Sr. No.	Name	Rate per month (₹)	Period in months	Amount paid to individual (₹)	Amount credited to University account (₹)	Total payment (₹)
1.	Dr. J. Naraina	3500	2	29400	2600	42000
2.	Dr. J.C. Sharma	2500	2	7400	2600	30,000
3.	Dr. O.P. Sharma	2500	2	7400	2600	30,000
4.	Dr. Rakesh	2000	7	6650	7350	4000
			Total:-	70850	45150	,16000

Although as per the norms/ allocation made in the project, there is a provision for the payment of the consultancy fee to the experts/consultants and Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor vide letter no. BudFMS-070-U7/-18396 dated 03/03/2011 has also approved the payment of such consultancy fee to the experts of the project but neither it was mentioned in the sanction letter that this consultancy fee was to be paid to the University employees also i.e. scientists/project Investigators/engineers who are experts in any such rule/power under the Act/ Statutes/ administrative powers which entitles the University employees to receive any such payment without the permission of the competent authority. The above observations were intimated vide audit request no. 3 dated 15/7/2011 but reply given as on dated 07/10/2011 was not satisfactory. Hence, it is the rule under which University employees can receive such payment of consultancy fee without the approval of the competent authority may be shown or matter may be regularized without the approval of the competent authority. The audit has also sought the date wise working record/norms vide audit observation no. 62 dated 15/7/2011 on the basis of which this payment was to be released but reply to this query given on dated 07/10/2011 was also not found satisfactory. In the absence of such record/information, the genuineness of the claim cannot be relied upon and matter needs to be looked into as per the established procedure of the University. Furthermore, the reply given by the Comptroller's office vide their letter no. Bud FMS-070-17/11-U2/-047-48 dated 08/01/2012 in response to the queries raised by the office vide letter no. URA/SLN/UHF/2011-10/-261 dated 05/02/2011 on this matter was also not found satisfactory and audit left with no other alternative but to admit the claim subject to the compliance of above audit observations.

U
{AR No. 2011-10/- 58 Dated 01/02/2012} U

U
U

43. Regarding publishing of advertisement in publications of instructions of the University

U

During audit of the contingent bill no. 369 of 00/2010 amounting to ₹10000/- regarding expenditure on advertisement, the following discrepancies were observed:-

U

- (a) As per instructions issued by the Registrar vide letter No. UHF/Reg/5-79-2010-27837-84 dated 05/10/10, all advertisements pertaining to the University must be given through the Global Networks, Advertising and Marketing, Chandigarh. However, these instructions have not been adhered to in this case and advertisement was directly given through a news paper "Punjab Khabar" thus, non-

compliance of the instructions may be justified and got regular audit with the approval of the competent authority.

- (b) The newspaper charged ₹10000/- for this advertisement but the basis on which the amount of ₹10,000/- was calculated is the rate, dimensions of advertisement etc. It was also not found mentioned in the bill. Therefore, the genuineness of payment could not be ascertained in the audit. Hence, amount charged by the newspaper may be compared with the rates of the authorized agency i.e. Global Networks and in this case the amount charged by the newspaper comes out to be on the higher side as compared to the charges of Global Network. Then the difference amount may be made good from appropriate source/officer/official at fault.

{AR No. 2011-12/- 59 (ii) Dated:- 01/02/2012}

Department of Food Science Technology

44. Purchase of a camera Nikon DSLR D3000 with kit lens Nikon 18-55 VR, 4 GB memory card and a carry case

During pre-audit of contingent bill no. 7 for 08/2011 regarding purchase of a Digital SLR camera of Nikon brand Model DSLR 3000 with kit lens Nikon 18-55 VR Lens, 4 GB Memory card and a carry case from M/s Sohan's Studio Digital Image Lab 58, The Mall Sumla for ₹25000/-. It is found that the procedure as prescribed in the University Accounts Manual was not followed in this case. As per Accounts Manual Rule 28(g) only such items can be purchased on single quotation basis which are of proprietary nature. As camera is not a proprietary item, hence, this purchase was required to be made after collecting the quotations from other similar firms to get the benefit of competitive market rates. Had the purchase been effected on quotation basis then it would definitely have been more beneficial to the University. In addition to above, it was also been noted that other University departments/ Research Stations are also availing such types of cameras. Therefore, purchase of this camera for ₹25000/- may be justified because Hon'ble Vice-Chancellor was also issued a letter No. HF/Comp/-CS/5-U3-2009(part-1) 996-2046 dated 26.5.2009 that the Directors/Deans may hold meeting of departments/offices/outstations under their control and individually prepare consolidated requirement with complete specifications while doing this they may also take into consideration the present stock position and feasibility of purchase and whether requirements of two or more departments for the same equipment could be pooled so as to avoid unnecessary purchase.

{AR No. 2011-12/- 40 Dated: 04/01/2011}

Department of Fruit Science

45. Expenditure incurred over and above the allocated funds

During the pre-audit of contingent bill numbered 478 and 479, it was been noticed that Eppendory Master Cycler Gradient (PCR) and Brunswick Refrigerator Incubator Maker were purchased by the department for ₹4,00,000/- each total costing ₹8,00,000/- from Eppendorng India Limited. However, the Funding Agency i.e. GOI Ministry of Science and Technology vide o/o NO SR/FST/LSU-456/2000(c) dated 24.5.2000 allocated ₹3,00,000/- and ₹3,25,000/- respectively. Thus the total provisions for purchase of these items were kept for ₹6,25,000. But the department has exceeded this limit by spending excess amount of ₹75,000/- (₹1,00,000/- + ₹75,000/-) over and above the provision of ₹6,25,000/-. Therefore, it was advised to the department to get this expenditure regularized by ensuring fresh approval of the funding agency for the actual expenditure.

{AR No/2011-12/- 64 Dated:- 20/03/2012}

Department of Mycology and Plant Pathology

46. Engagement of Sh. Ram Singh S/o of Sh. Nek Ram village Kotla Panjola as contractual labourer

During pre-audit of contingent bill no. 31 dated 05/07/2011 for ₹5,280/- and perusal of the record/documents submitted with the bill for pre-audit, it was noticed that Sh. Ram Singh S/o of Sh. Nek Ram village Kotla Panjola, District Sirmour was engaged as contractual labourer on fixed salary of ₹3,600/- per month w.e.f. 22-09-2011 to 20-08-2011 under the project entitled HMM-053-04 vide letter no. MPP/UHF/HMM-053-04/2005-06-778-82 dated 23/06/2011. As per joining report submitted by Sh. Ram Singh, he joined his duty on 22-06-2011 but his attendance was marked by the department w.e.f. 08-06-2011 and wages were also being paid accordingly, which has resulted in excess payment of ₹680/- (w.e.f. 8-6-11 to 21-6-11). It was also very surprising that Sh. Ram Singh whose letter of engagement was issued on 23/06/2011 has actually joined the duty on 22/06/2011 i.e. one day prior to issue of the engagement letter. Further, the letter of engagement was also full of mistakes as it was shown issued on 23-6-11 asking the candidate to join on 22-6-11 besides the period of engagement had also been wrongly mentioned as w.e.f. 22-9-2011 to 28-8-2011 which is highly objectionable and hence, this irregularity brought to the notice of the higher authorities of the University. It was also advised that in future all

the bills may be submitted to audit after proper scrutiny to avoid delay in payments and to avoid unnecessary correspondence

{AR No. 2011-12/- 10 Dated: 06/7/2011}

47. Purchase of heaters in violation of procedures of the University

While pre-auditing the contingent bill No. 472 of 2020 amounting to ₹ 4150/- and bill No. 481 of 2020 amounting to ₹ 669/-, it has been noticed that the department of MPP purchased two Halogen Heaters (pillar type) from M/s Auja General store, The Mall Solan for ₹ 4150/- (₹ 670 + ₹ 2480/-). The expenditure was put for pre-audit under contingent bill no. 472 of 2020. Later on, the department purchased another heater pillar for ₹ 669/- from same supplier and expenditure was put up in the contingent bill no. 481 of 2020. These heater pillars were purchased from open market without calling for quotations from M/s Auja General Store vide C.M. No. 36930 dated 29.10.2011 for ₹ 670/-, C.M. No. 36936 dated 27.10.2011 for ₹ 2480/- and C.M. No. 36953 dated 28.10.2011 for ₹ 669/- (total for ₹ 5809/-) by splitting up the purchase to bypass the rules of University Accounts Manual. Moreover, this purchase should have been effected on the basis of rates approved by the Govt. notification No. 4/Ind/SP-3(E-6)(01)19/2009(28) dated 22.7.2009 which were effective till 31.3.2010. It is pertinent to mention here that the rates for heater pillars as been approved as ₹ 572/- under above referred notification. Thus, by ignoring the rules of Financial propriety and the proper procedure laid down in the regard, the University has been put to net loss of ₹ 103/- (5809-4706). It is also noted that purchase was intentionally split up in order to avoid the necessity of obtaining the sanction of competent authority which is against the provisions of University Accounts Manual rule No. 28. It is irregularity was pointed out on dated 31.3.2010 which has not been complied with by the deptt and replies were not found satisfactory. Thus, loss sustained by the University as pointed out above may now be made good from the person at fault.

{AR No. 2011-12/- 29 Dated: 26/09/2011}

University of Science and Technology, KVK, Rohtak, Distt, Shimla

48. Regarding hiring of taxi from scheme No. 001-60 (POI) for ₹ 6382/-

During the course of pre-audit of contingent bill no. 84 of 07/2011, it has been noticed that expenditure amounting to ₹ 6382/- for tax hiring charges were incurred. The tax was paid from scheme No. HCR-04-60 and

the sanction was given by the PI. In this case the PI has no powers to allow the tax and sanction the expenditure from the long term scheme. Therefore, the sanction of competent authority as per delegation of power may be shown. Further, the copy of the approved tour programme/tour diary was not attached/shown to audit. These observations were pointed out in the bill of audit memo No.7 dated 09.09.10 and the reply given by the programme Coordinator was not found satisfactory with reference to the above observations. Therefore, Unedful Un UtU s lase Umay Udone Uand U compliance shown to audit. U

U

{AR No. 2011/12/-U51 Dated: 26/02/2011}

U

U

U

U

Post Audit Reports U

U

49. Post Audit of Accounts of Estate Office for the period 4/2009 to 3/2010 U

U

U During the post audit of Estate Office for the period 4/2009 to 3/2010, U apart from other irregularities as per audit request issued in this behalf, U the following major irregularities were noted during the test check U

U

(a) Non recovery of licence fee amounting to ₹ 605352/- U

U

U It is observed that sum of ₹ 6,05,352/- on account of arrear of licence fee was shown as been pointed out vide letter No. HF/EO-U 9/98/-U673-76 U dated 20/9/10 of the Estate Office and which was required to be deposited up to 30/9/10 U as has not been deposited till date by the concerned Officer/Official. As this is a serious irregularity, hence this irregularity attracts the imposition of penal interest. Therefore, the amount of ₹ 605352/- along with penal interest on till 31/7/11 works out to ₹ 93325/- @ 8.5% P.A. for 10 months i.e. from 10/10 to 31/7/11 plus amount of upto date penal interest may also be added for the period for which the amount remains un-deposited with University Exchequer and the final amount arrived at in the manner as indicated above i.e. (Amount of arrear of licence fee + penal interest calculated on amount of licence fee up to the date of deposit) may be deposited with the University Exchequer and compliance be shown to the audit. The amount of penal interest to the date of deposit may be worked out departmentally. U

U

(b) Short recovery of licence fee amounting to ₹ 17070/- U

U

While checking the licence fee of allottees of International student hostel of the teacher, it has been observed that licence fee of ₹ 17070/- has not been recovered from the allottees of the flats till 31/3/11 as per detail given below. As per norms stipulated in rules II(U) of the House allotment rules, the licence fee becomes recoverable/chargeable from the date of occupation of accommodation or from the 00th day from the date of receipt of allotment order, whichever is earlier whereas this rule has not been followed in these cases which may be justified and the final amount of licence fee i.e. licence fee of ₹ 17070/- payable till 31/3/11 plus the due and unrecovered licence fee after 31/3/11 on this account along with penal interest may be worked out departmentally and the same may be recovered/deposited in the University exchequer under intimation to audit.

Sr. No.	Name of Allottees and House No.	Date of allotment	Date of charging of licence fee	Period for which chargeable	Rate of licence fee	Amount of recovery
1.	Dr. Happy Dev. B01	31.12.00	01.01.01	01.01.01 to 31.03.11	050/-	2845/-
2.	Dr. R.S. Chandel 202	-do-	-do-	-do-	-do-	2845/-
3.	Dr. S.K. Bhargava 201	-do-	-do-	-do-	-do-	2845/-
4.	Dr. Sta Ram Duman 302	-do-	-do-	-do-	-do-	2845/-
5.	Dr. K.S. Pant 02	-do-	-do-	-do-	-do-	2845/-
6.	Dr. N.S. Tiku 101	-do-	-do-	-do-	-do-	2845/-
				Total		17070/-

(c) Non Recovery of ₹ 3562/- on account of licence fee

While checking the license fee and demand register, it has been observed that the licence fee of ₹ 3562/- is still lying un-recovered from the allottees of the accommodation since 2008 as per detail given below, which may be justified and the amount be recovered along with the penal interest under intimation to audit. U

Sr. No.	Name of Employee	Type	Rate	Date of allotment	Date of occupation	Recoverable for the period	Remarks
	Dr.H.R.Sharma HRS,Kandaghat	IV	493	3.3.08	7.08	23.3.08 to 30.6.08	₹1622/- recoverable and required to be deposited vide letter No.UHF/E,O-89/III/05/-3306 dated 26.11.08
2.	Dr.Som Dutt Sharma RHFRS,Bhata	III	388	20.10.00	21.3.11	0 to 31.3.11	₹1940/- recoverable vide letter No.UHF/EO-89/IV/2009/-43-44 dated 21.4.11 issued to the pay cell

(A/R no. 44 dated 02.12.2011)

50. Post Audit of the accounts of the department of Forest Products for the period 4/2009 to 3/U

During the post audit of the department of Forest Products for the period 4/2009 to 3/U, apart from other irregularities as per audit requisitions issued by the self, the following major irregularities were noticed during the test check U

(a) Non Maintenance of Register of Cash Receipt Books

As per rule 4.16 & 4.18 of the University Accounts Manual, the Drawing and disbursement Officer of the department is required to maintain the “Register of Cash Receipt Books” for the blank cash receipt books procured from the central store of the University. But no such register has been maintained by the department/ DDO and instead blank cash receipt books have been accounted for in the statutory register (Inventory No.95) at page 82.

(b) Non Maintenance of the Cash Receipt Register (CRR)

As per rule 18.2 of the University Accounts Manual, the cashier of the department is required to maintain a “Cash Receipt Register” in the prescribed form No. KVV-8/8 and all sale proceeds of different sections of the department are to be recorded in this register before their accumulation in the departmental cash book. But this register has not been maintained by the department. In the absence of which it was not possible to trace the income of the department accurately and appropriately.

(c) Non certification of the receipt books

According to rule 4.16 of the Accounts Manual “before bringing a receipt book in use a certificate should be recorded thereon as to the number of receipts contained therein.” But no such certificate has been found recorded in the receipt books used by different sections of the department. This is a very serious matter and needs to be justified as to why the said rules have not been complied with. Besides appropriate instructions in this regard may also be issued so that lapse is not repeated in future.

{AR No. 2011-12/- 65 Dated: 24/03/2012}

Certification of Annual Accounts for the year 2011-12

5.1 Observations on the Annual Accounts of the University

- (a) BUDGET:-** As per information/records made available to the audit, the following is the sector wise position of budget approved, actual expenditure incurred and GIA received against these from the Govt. of HP for the year

2011-12. However, the annual accounts stand submitted to the University after verification:-

Sr No	Major Head/Sector	Approved Budget estimate ₹ in Lacs	Approved Revised Budget estimate ₹ in lacs	Actual expenditure ₹ in Lacs	GIA received ₹. in Lacs
(A)	HORTICULTURE				
(a)	Plan	3765.00	4865.43	3645.55	3200.00
(b)	Non-Plan	0000	000	0.01	2001
(c)	SP	95.80	94.66	96.65	55.00
	Total (A)	3860.80	4960.10	3842.21	3257.01
(B)	FORESTRY				
(a)	Plan	0000	0000	0000	990.00
(b)	Non-Plan	0000	0000	0000	0.00
(c)	SP	25.00	28.75	23.33	25.00
	Total (B)	25.00	28.75	23.33	25.00
(c)	USCSP	990.00	1462.83	487.87	990.00
Total	Total (C)	990.00	1462.83	487.87	990.00
	Grand Total A+B+C	4875.80	6451.68	5353.41	4272.01

From the above data, it is seen that ₹ 4272.01 lacs were received as Grant by the University but the expenditure of ₹ 5353.41 Lacs were incurred. The expenditure were incurred in excess by ₹ 1081.40 lacs by the University. The expenditure more than receipt/grant may be justified.

(b) The Institute of Biotechnology and Environment Science, Nerul was created vide notification No. HF/Reg/ GA/5-1(84)/-U/-305-98 dated 19.4.98 and further the Scheme code UHF-004-63 (self financing scheme) was allotted vide letter No. HF/Bud/2-143/2011-12/7249 dated 23.9.11. As per HPFR 72, sanction to the expenditure of money becomes operative only when funds have been appropriated to meet such expenditure. While checking the Annual Accounts for the year 2011-12, it is noticed that an expenditure of ₹ 6,23,034 has been incurred under scheme UHF-004-63 but neither the budget provision was made nor allocation of funds has been made on this regard. Hence, it is against the general principles of the University financial propriety to incur expenditure without proper budgetary provision which may be justified and expenditure be regularized with the approval of competent authority.

(c) Bank reconciliation statements of the various bank accounts operated by the UHF Nauni have not been annexed to the annual account. However, the bank reconciliation statements were prepared in the bank books. These should be annexed to the annual accounts.

(d) Two new revolving funds were operated by Dean College of Horticulture under the Head Ue HCR-16U-01 & HCR-U62-0U but both of these were not taken in revolving fund's details. Moreover funds worth ₹ 4,00,000/- & ₹ 5,50,000/- transferred from ICA-069-01 and ICA-068-01 to Dean COH were debited as expenditure whereas the same was not the expenditure and these should have been treated as part of revolving fund which may be justified.

(e) Following amounts have been deducted from expenditure in the ledger and annual accounts. The reasons for their deduction were not explained as a result of which their authenticity could not be verified.

Scheme	Description	Amount
HPL-024-56	Estt off Dee Kandaghat	(-) 2,01,800.00
HPL-U44-36	UGC Arrears of Teachers	(-) 10,46,0954.00
HCR-U45-31	Seed production in Agriculture crops and fisheries	(-) 1,83,707.00
CAH-00U-07	One time catch up grant(entomology)	(-) 18,042.00
CAH-00U-16	-do- (ICAR)	(-) 7,100.00
CAH-00U-53	-do- (BAJAURA)	(-) 15,070.00
CAH-00U-55	Modernization of AU farms	(-) 5.00
CAH-002-57	Drawal of contingent Advance	(-) 13,500.00
ICA-055-02	Deptt of Fruit Science	(-) 5,299.00
ICA-067-37	Central Development Assistance(Registrar)	(-) 21,967.00
HMM-031-55	Mass propagation project	(-) 49,049.00
HGI-132-05	to strengthen the Post-graduate teaching	(-) 19,407.00
FRE-00U-16	ICFRE Projects	(-) 54,104.00
HMS-232-39	Farmers Training	(-) 5,609.00

(f) The sanction letters in respect of following grants have not been shown to audit in the absence of source of grants and purpose for which these are received could not be verified.

Scheme	Description	Amount	Remarks
HCR-004-08	AICR panel Floriculture	8,08,000	Sanction letter not shown.

-do- U	-do- U	4,72,000 U	-do- U
Not mentioned U	D rector of Hort U HP U	U 55,309 U	-do- U
Not mentioned U	World wide fund U	25,00,000 U	-do- U

U

(g) U A sum of ₹8525/- was deducted from grant n aid rece ved under GOI U projects for tUe year 2011-U2. U e amount was actually accounted for th U tUe year 2010-11 under Misc projects (untraced/train ng Uead) U e same U was transferred to Dean COF account v de letter No.UHF/Wc/2009-10 dated U 22/6/11. U us, nstead of reducing the current years grant, tUe adjustment U on tUs account sould Uave been made inU tUe open ng balance of tUe U current year. U

(h) U e GIA received under UHF project for tUe year 201U-U2 UHFU00U36 U as been sUown as (- ₹ 6,00,000) w tU the remarks tUat tUe same was U wrongly added at serial NoU44p-60 of annual accounts of 2010-U w ereas U t actually perta ns to Dean's Account Dur ng tUe last year, itUwas taken U wrongly under tUe Head Grant U Ad received for North Zone Agr cultural U fair 2010-U so tUe same sould Uave been adjusted n tUe open ng balance U of thU same hUad nstead of reduc ng tUe current year's total grants U

(i) U e UGIA Ureceived Uunder UMin Mission Uproject Uwas Ureduced Uby ₹ 20,00,000/- withUut mention ng any reason, On scrut ny U U found tUat U ₹80000 and ₹10,00,000/ were transferred to ICA ResearcU complex NEH on U 9/1U/11 & 5/3/U2 respect vely for nUrr ng expenditure and thU same were U allowed to be booked under HMM-04-03 but tUe same were not booked U under tUe required Uead nthe annual accounts. U

U

(j) U A Uun of ₹ 375908/ U as been Ushown Uas Income Ufrom Uelectr city U cUarges. It Uas been found tUat tUese charges are collected for tUe use of U electr c ty for w cU tUe payment Uas been made to H P Electr c ty Board, U tUerefore, it is not a real ncome to tUe Univers tyU U

(k)U Revolv ng fund No HPL -038-38 (modern zat on of AU farm Integrated Hort culture Based Farm ng System Uas created v de comptroller off ce U letter noUBid-4-U92/2010-11/1857U dated 31/3/1U from CAH-001U8 and a U cUeque No 9U6295 dated 3U/3/U for ₹U0,00,000/- was UssuedU U e Bank U account for thU revolv ng fund was opened U UCO Bank Nauni BrancU on U 29/4/11U de (A/c No 09690U 0009666) However, In tUe year 2010/U also U t e expend tUe Uwas booked Un U e Scheme CAH-001U8 w ereas U e U revolv ng fund was not prepared at tUat t me and tUis tUe same also not U ncluded in tUe Annual Accounts of 20U0-U U us, ntUe Annual Accounts of U 2011-U2, tUe open ng balance of tUe grant was requ red to be increased by ₹ U 0,00,000/- U

(l) Merit cum Means Scholarship in SB O.P Nauli Account No 65120802798

An account was opened with ₹ 000/- and later on ₹ 6,00,000/- were deposited for the merit cum means scholarship. It has been observed that ₹ 6,00,000 were later on transferred to Dean Account on 25/2/12 and further operation of the scholarship was done by the office of the Dean COH. The proceed of ₹ 7407/- on 3.3.12 was transferred to SB account 055002750725 whereas ₹ 5379/- were also required to be transferred to Dean Account as the Income of ₹ 5379/- was earned and ₹ 6,00,000/- meant for Merit cum Scholarship was not transferred. The detail of amount which was not transferred is given below:

Total Interest earned		
31/12/11	3105/-	
3/3/12	3637/-	
Total		6742/-
Less Amount Related to Comptroller's Office Account		
1) Interest ₹ 000/- @ 4.5% w.e. 1/8/11 to 3/3/12 i.e. 226 days	₹ 28-00	
2) ₹ 000/- Deposited on 1/8/11	₹ 1000-00	
3) Bank charges on ₹ 6,00,000 (6,00,000-599665) cleared	₹ 335-00	
Total:		- ₹ 363-00
Amount Related to Merit Cum Scholarship account		₹ 5379-00

Thus, the above transfer to Comptroller account may be justified and be deposited to the concerned account i.e. Dean's account for merit cum means scholarship.

(m) Irregularities in effecting transfer entries amounting to ₹ 10,46,00,954/- by Comptroller office

From the test check of the transfer entries, the following irregularities were not noticed which may be attended to:

(i) **Transfer entry no 6 dated 3/13:** An expenditure of ₹ 9,36,59,486/- pertaining to state plan has been transferred to central sector (UGC) No reason/justification and transfer entry has been enclosed with the voucher. The transfer of such expenditure was wholly unjustified being not a fit charge.

(ii) **Transfer entry no 7 dated 3/13:** An expenditure of ₹ 1,09,42,468/- pertaining to state Horticulture Plan Scheme UHPL-44-36 has been transferred to various Schemes under Head HMS. No reason/justification for such transfer of expenditure has been enclosed/provided with the voucher. The transfer of such expenditure was wholly unjustified being not a fit charge.

(n) GPF/CPF A/C:

(i) A sum of ₹ 8,25,353/-- and ₹ 12,92,397/- lying in the credit of the various subscribers of GPF and CPF respectively in whose accounts no transactions were made during 2011-12. In this regard, it is doubted that the subscribers have left the University service and the amount is lying unclaimed. Thus, a detailed scrutiny may be conducted in these cases and after detailed scrutiny of each case, if the amount actually found unclaimed or not due to them, then action to settle these accounts may be taken as per provisions of Rule 26 of the HPFR, 1971, as the case may be.

(ii) Similarly a sum of ₹ 3,62,633/- and ₹ 37,703/- were lying respectively as negative balance in some of the GPF and CPF subscribers accounts, which ceased to be in University services, which is a serious matter of concerns. In this regards, reasons and circumstances for these negative balances may be pointed out, besides taking suitable action to settle these accounts immediately.

(iii) Interest accrued on ₹ 50 lacs lent to the HBA on loan basis has not been taken into A/C while preparing assets and liability statement of CPF Account. In absence of which the said statement is not depicting its true picture. The statement may now be corrected accordingly besides taking care of this aspect in future.

(iv) While checking interest income of FDRs which were prepared out of GPF A/C, it has been observed that an interest loss of ₹ 9606/- were less realized by the University on maturity and on prematurety of some FDRs, a detail of which has been given at **(Annexure-B)**. Therefore, the matter regarding realizing lesser amount of interest may be looked into and the matter may be taken up with the bank and amount realized short may be made good to the University exchequer. In future, proper checks may be exercised while realising premature/maturity payment of FDRs so that the chances of realizing less amount could be avoided.

(o) Pension Corpus Fund

(i) Interest loss of ₹ 2487/- due to non-credit of maturity proceeds of FDRs of contributory Pension corpus account on due dates

While checking contributory Pension corpus A/C No.096010000428, it has been observed that due to negligence in the maintenance of record of due dates and non-credit maturity proceeds of FDRs of contributory pension corpus accounts on due dates, interest loss of ₹ 2487/- occurred to the University exchequer as per detail given below, which is required to be made good from the quarter concerned.

S.No	FDR No	Amount of FDR	Date of Investment	Date of Maturity	Rate of Intt	Amount credited to SB A/C	Amount credited	Loss of Intt.
	0879117	541076	23.10.08	24.4.11	7%	28.40	590106	(4 days late) ₹453
2.	0879127	916000	02.10.08	05.11.08	7%	2.50	999005	(4 days late) ₹766
3.	0984669	551000	02.10.08	05.12.08	7%	23.50	600930	(11 days late) ₹268
							Total:	₹ 2487

(ii) Pension Corpus (Interest loss of ₹1952/- on maturity of FDR)

An interest of ₹ 952/- has been less accrued to the University exchequer on maturity of FDR No.692103 dated 26.8.08 as per detail given below, which may be realized from the bank and credited to the University exchequer.

FDR No	Dated	Amounting to	@	Date of Maturity	Amount realized	Amount to be realized
692103	26.8.08	8500000	7.5%	3.3.12	953926/-	9515878/-
Amount realized short						₹1952/-

(p) HBA Fund U

(i) U As per annual accounts of HBA Fund and further information made U available to tUe aud t, Ut noticed tUat Interest of SB A/C amounting to ₹ 740874.52 & ₹ 17692.52/-, nterest on SB a/c, nterest on FDR amount ng U to ₹ 108136/- and interest from employees amounting to ₹ 615046/- were U earned In fact tUs amount is tUe income of tUe Unvers ty and tUs sUould U ave been accounted for under proper head/sector on rece pt s de in tUe U Annual Accounts of tUe Unvers ty but the same Uas not been accounted for U under proper Uead/sector on rece pt s de in tUe Annual Accounts of tUe Unvers ty due to w ch tUe receipt and payment account of tUe University U does not dep ct true and fa r p ctur e of its affa rs U erefore, it is adv sed to U make necessary correct ons n tUe Annual Account and n future tUs aspect U may also be taken care of U

U

(ii) U As on 3U 3.10 a sum of ₹ 4445760/- were outstanding as refundable U amount of HBA from tUe employees of tUe Unvers ty bes des a sum of ₹ 583377/- were ly ng at credit Un sav ng A/C and FDRsU U us Un all total U amount of ₹ 5029137/- were lying Un HBA Fund A/C as on 3 3U which U nfact s a part & parcel of Unvers ty fund except tht of ₹ 50 LakU payable U to CPF A/C. U erefore, tUese amount of HBA sUould been sUown/depicted U under proper Head of Account of the Unvers ty, However, Un absence of U correct dep ct onof funds, tUe tht Unvers ty does not reflect tUe true and U fa r p ctur e of its affa rs TUerefore, it is adv sed to take necessary correct ve U steps to rect fy tUe Annul Accounts besides tak ng care of tUs aspect Un U future also U

U

(q) UReconc liat on wittUvar ous banksU

(i) U Bank account witU minus/negative balance:- U

U WU lecUeck ng tUe bank reconc lat on statements of UCO bank A/C U NoU U 676 and 3960, Ut is found Uthat Utheir Uclosing Ubalances Uare ₹ (-) 65,72,461U3) and ₹ (-) 17569.74) as on 3U 3.10, w cUs a very ser ous U lapse on tUe part of mak ng transact ons wt t e banks U erefore, itU s U suggested tht tUe reasons of resulting bank balances nto negative may be U looked Unto and tUe officer/official dealing witU tUe banks be d rected to U exerc se proper v g lance and cUecks w lemak ng tUe transact ons w tUe U banks so tht such pos tion is not repeated, in future. U

(ii) U Crediting of Interest ncome of one account to other bank accounts:-U

U WU cUeck ng bank A/C NoU 55002750725, it Uas been observed tUat U nterest Ureceipt Uof ₹ 140214/- U(nterest Uon UFDR) Upertain ng Uto UA/C U NoU 55002750599 U as Ubeen Uwrongly Ucredited Un UA/C U No 550027550725 U S m larly an interest rece pt of ₹ 567U23/- perta n ng to FDR made out of A/C U

No.390 U as been credited U n Bank A/c No. 676. Due to these wrong U transfers/credits Interest Income of all the accounts do not reflect their U factual position. Therefore, these entries requires rectification so that all U accounts may show the factual position in the Annual Accounts. U

U

(ii) U Loss of Interest due to keeping huge balances in the saving bank U accounts U

U The U Director of bank A/C No 55002750849 of the University and bank U account no 6501030625 (SBOP) of LMRS, Nagrota Bagwan, U has been U observed that huge amount as per detailed given below was lying unutilized in U the saving bank accounts. If these unutilized amounts were wisely deposited U in the short term FDRs then higher amount of income by way of interest U could have been fetched to the University. As intimated by the U office of the Comptroller, maximum rate of interest on fixed term deposits U was 10% p.a during the year 2011-12. Hence, by keeping the amount in the U saving bank account where the rate of interest was 3% to 4% and which U is about 6% less than the rate of interest on FDRs, University has suffered U huge loss of interest, which could have been earned if the amount kept in U the saving bank accounts were deposited wisely in some term deposits. U

U

U

U

Month U	Amount U in U balance U (average U minimum U balance) in Rupees U	U
4/11 U	2975032/- U	Bank U A/C U Number U 55002750849 U
5/11 U	22447102/- U	do U
6/11 U	825340/- U	do U
2/12 U	4371000 U	bank U account U no U 65010306251 (SBOP) U of LMRS, Nagrota U Bagwan, U
7/12 UU	40945000 U	do U
2/12 UU	33958300 U	do U
3/12 UU	26390600 U	do U

U

(iv) U Short realization of Interest income due to deduction of UDS U

U UDS amounting to ₹ 10302/- (out of Interest Income) was deducted on U the maturity of FDR's during the year 2011-12 (as detailed below) due to U which Interest receipt on maturity of FDR's realized short by ₹ 10302/- U. Therefore, the amount realized short may be made good from the bank or U got refunded from Income Tax department and account of the same may U be shown to audit. U

S.No	FDR No.	Dated	DOM	Amount ng to	@	Maturity Amount	Amount Credited
1.	31004	3.8.11	2.9.11	5012842/-	6.25%	5038593/-	5033447/-
2.	31005	3.8.11	2.9.11	5012842/-	6.25%	5038593/-	5033447/-

DS Deducted = ₹ 5051/- + ₹ 5151/- = ₹ 10302/-

It is also advised that relevant certificate for non deduction of TDS from the University deposits may be submitted to the banks so that banks may not deduct TDS on the interest income of university in future.

(v) Deduction of collection charges by the banks:-

In most of the cases bank/collection charges have been paid to the banks without getting the expenditure sanctioned from the competent authority with a regular. In some other cases, collection charges were paid to the banks on outstanding cheques received from the customers and in such cases University exchequer was put to an avoidable loss. Now either these charges may be justified or recoveries be made good from concerned customers or from an appropriate source besides taking corrective steps to prevent such losses in future.

(vi) Income amounting to ₹ 241607/- deposited in A/C No. 55002750725 not credited to bank

Income amounting to ₹ 235792/- pertaining to 2010-11 and ₹ 5805/- prior to 31.3.11 (as per bank reconciliation statements) were not collected/credited by the bank till 31.3.2011, which is a serious lapse. The matter regarding non-credit of University Income may be required to be taken up besides taking necessary steps for its recovery and the same may be deposited to the University exchequer after recovering it from appropriate source and compliance intimated to audit.

(r) Debit COH A/C No. 50600

(i) Loss of interest of ₹ 1048/- due to late credit maturity of FDR

Loss of interest of ₹ 1048/- (as per detail given below) occurred to the University exchequer due to late credit of proceeds of FDR no. 03972. Matter regarding late credit and resultant loss of interest may be taken up with bank and amount be made good to the University exchequer.

FDR, NO	Amount	Date	Interest @	Date of Maturity	Maturity Amount	Credited in SB	Intt. Loss
---------	--------	------	------------	------------------	-----------------	----------------	------------

						A/C U on dated	UU
03972	U545783/	U9/10/U0	U7.25%	9/U0/11U	586441/-	U 8/10/1U (9days U late)	U 048/- U

U

(i) U Non drawl of cUeque amount ng ₹ U950/-U

It Us noticed thbt cUeque noU 453349 dated 7.9.10 amounting to ₹ U950/- Ussued but sUown as not drawn tll date. U erefore, Ut may be U confirmed thbt w ether tUs cUeque was actually not drawn from any otUer U account of tUe Un vers ty and if not drawn tUen necessary correct ve entr es U may be made n tUe relevant account/ledger and same be got ver f ed from U audit U

U

(s) U Revolving Fund Account:-U

U WU lecUeck ng revolv ng fund accounts, tUe following d sUepanc esU ave been observed :- U

() U Loss of Interest of ₹ 44280/- due to pre-mature encasUment of FDR'sU

U W le cUeck ng revolv ng fund account of RHRSS Tabo, U has been U observed tUat FDR's of d fferent denom nat on amount ng to ₹ 593063 (tUe U deta lof w cU Usenclosed Un **(Annexure-C)**U were pre -matured on U 7.U and ₹ 680000/- U were Utransferred Uto Comptroller's account. UDue Uto pre-U mature payment of tUese FDR's an interest loss of ₹ 44280/- was occurred to U tUe Un vers ty excUequer, w cU could hUve been avo ded T Ue loss may be U justified otUerw sethU amount be made good to tUe Un vers ty excUequer U under ntmat ion to aud t. U

(i)U Loss of Interest of ₹ 5175/- due to less cred t of interest on tUe matur ty of FDR's:- U

U An Uterest loss of ₹ 5175/- as per detail gUven at **(Annexure-D)** was U occurred to tUe Un vers ty excUequer due to receipt of lesser amount of U nterest on tUe matur ty of some FDR's w cU were made out of revolv ng U fund maintained for the runn ng act vities of publ cation unit of DEEU U e U matter may be taken up witU bank amount to rece vetUe short amount of U nterest and tUe same be accounted for U n the Univers ty excUequer under U nt mat ion to audit U

(ii) U Loss of interest of ₹ 2047/- due Uto non-cred t of maturity amountU of FDR's on due dates:-U

U

U WU lecUeck ng revolv ng fund for publicat on un tof DEE, Ut has been U observed tUat due to late cred t of FDR's on tUe rdue dates, an nterest loss U

of ₹ 2047/- occurred to the University exchequer, which may be justified or otherwise be made good from the quarters concerned. Details of FDR's are given in the **(Annexure-E)**

(iv) Keeping huge balances of revolving funds in the saving bank accounts

While auditing the receipts and payments of various revolving fund accounts, it has been observed that huge amounts were lying unutilized in the saving bank A/C of these revolving funds for months together or even throughout the year. Had these unutilized funds been wisely invested in short term fixed deposits by keeping in view the day to day requirements of these funds, rather than keeping the funds unutilized in the SB A/C then the greater income could have been fetched without hampering the activities of the respective funds. Therefore it is advised that in future necessary steps as suggested above may be kept in mind.

(v) Income not pertaining to fund deposited in the A/C

While checking revolving fund accounts, it has been noticed that income not pertaining to the activities of revolving fund account were also credited therein, which in fact should have been credited to Comptroller's A/C. Due to this irregularity, the annual a/c of respective revolving funds are not showing their real picture. Therefore, it is suggested/adviced to issue necessary directions/instruction to the concerned functionaries so that real picture of respective revolving could be evaluated.

(vi) Bank charges/collection charges paid without proper sanction

While auditing/checking the revolving fund accounts, it has been observed that bank/collection charges have been paid to bank without getting the expenditure sanctioned from the competent authority, which is quite regular practice in some other cases, collection charges were paid to banks for outstation cheques received from the customers. In such cases, the University exchequer was put to avoidable loss. Now, either these charges may be justified or recoveries from the concerned customers be made besides taking corrective steps to prevent such losses in future.

(vii) Non maintenance of FDR register of revolving fund of RHRS, Sharba

It is noticed that revolving fund of RHRS Sharba was created on dated 23/02 and FDR No 29040000 R0000040 was prepared by the stationer PUNB for ₹ 58000/- the interest credited by bank in pass book was as follows:-

Dated U	Amount U
26.9U U	779 U
21/10/11 U	234 U
26.10U U	790 U
20.1U 2 U	222 U
Total U	2025 U

U However, the FDR Register was not shown to audit, hence the accuracy of collections of interest could not be checked. The same is required to be put up to audit for checking. U

(vi) RHRS, Masobra (Revolving fund for flor culture) U

U A sum of ₹ 20000 was wrongly debited by Indian Bank Masobra branch A/c No 54960016 on dated 22/2/11U- and the same were corrected U on 28.5U U after 95 days and hence, this has resulted into a loss of interest of ₹ 208/- approximately, which may be justified and the matter is required to be taken with bank for the credit of interest amount. U

U

U

(ix) Director of Research- Model Farm revolving fund A/C No UCO-09666 U

U The revolving fund A/C of Director of Research was sanctioned to maintain model farm activities, but it has been observed that the huge amount was kept in the saving bank account throughout the year 2011-12. Had, the same amount been properly deposited in some FDRs (term deposits) instead of keeping the same in the saving bank A/C then the interest could have fetched to the university exclusively as during the year 2011-12 maximum rate of interest on term deposits is estimated as 10% p.a., which is approximately 6% higher than the interest available on SB A/C. Due to the mismanagement in the way of keeping of funds in the saving bank accounts instead of FDRs, huge amount of loss of interest occurred to the University exclusively. Therefore, it is suggested to make proper management of funds in future. Further, revolving fund ledger was not maintained as per the procedure as laid down in the Accounts Manual. It was just maintained like a contingent register. Therefore, it is suggested that proper record/ledger as per procedure as laid down in the Accounts Manual may be maintained to keep the record for audit purpose. U

(AR no.5 dated 03/06/2013) U

U

52U Conclusion

U The observations pointed out above requires Immediate attention of U
the authorities. Further, non adjustment of advances for the last many years U
needs Immediate attention and outstanding audit paras containing serious U
irregularities also require immediate remedial measures for its settlement. U

U

U

Sd

Sd U

Deputy Controller (Audit) U
Dr. Y. S. Parmar University of U
Horticulture & Forestry, U
Naun -SolanUU

Director U
Local Fund Accounts, U
H.B. Simala-9.U

U

U
U
U
U
U

Report Issued vide Letter no -Fn(LA)H(C(05)(04)99/85-Vol-21-6095-6099 U
On Dated :-07 September 2013

U
U
U
U
U
U
U
U
U

U