

**REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO
INQUIRE INTO THE IMPROPER
CONDUCT OF A MEMBER**

(SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA)

*(Presented to Speaker, Lok Sabha on 08 December, 2016)
(Laid on the Table on 08 December, 2016)*



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

December, 2016/Agrahayana, 1938 (Saka)

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO
INQUIRE INTO THE IMPROPER
CONDUCT OF A MEMBER

(SIXTEENTH LOK SABHA)

(Presented to Speaker, Lok Sabha on 08 December, 2016)
(Laid on the Table on 08 December, 2016)



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

December, 2016/Agrahayana, 1938 (Saka)

P & E No. 4

Price: ₹ 125.00

© 2017 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Fifteenth Edition) and Printed by the General Manager, Govt. of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi-110 002.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
1. Personnel of the Committee	(iii)
2. Report	1
3. Appendices	59
4. Annexure	74
5. Minutes of Sitzings of Committee	77

PERSONNEL OF THE COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO THE IMPROPER
CONDUCT OF A MEMBER
(2016)

Dr. Kirit Somaiya — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Anandrao Adsul
3. Smt. Meenakashi Lekhi
4. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
5. Dr. (Smt.) Ratna De (Nag)
6. Shri Thota Narasimham
7. Dr. Satya Pal Singh (Baghpat)
8. Shri K.C. Venugopal
9. Dr. P. Venugopal

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Anoop Mishra — *Secretary General*
2. Shri Ravindra Garimella — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shri M.K. Madhusudhan — *Director*
4. Dr. Rajiv Mani — *Additional Director*

REPORT

I. Introduction

I, the Chairperson of the Committee to Inquire into the Improper Conduct of a Member having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Report to the House in the matter. The subject of examination relates to improper conduct of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP of having unauthorised video recording of the security arrangements of Parliament House Estate etc. and brought it in the public domain by live-streaming it on the social media.

2. The Committee in all held 13 sittings in the matter. The relevant minutes of the sittings form part of the Report and are appended hereto.

3. The Adhoc Committee was constituted by the Speaker, Lok Sabha on 25 July, 2016. The Committee at their first sitting held on 25 July, 2016 had threshold deliberations on the matter and framed their future course of action. The Committee also had a preliminary briefing on security implications arising out of this incident from Joint Secretary (Security), Lok Sabha Secretariat. The Committee also took on record a request letter dated 25 July, 2016 received, from Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP, wherein he *inter alia* sought three days time to furnish his comments. The Committee also viewed the video footage as uploaded by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP on facebook and also decided to take formal evidence of the Commissioner of Police, Delhi and Joint Secretary (Security), Lok Sabha Secretariat, to understand the security implications and the sequence of events of this incident, at their next sitting.

4. The Committee at their second sitting held on 26 July, 2016 examined on oath, Shri Alok Kumar Verma, Commissioner of Police, Delhi and Shri Yogesh Deshmukh, Joint Secretary (Security), Lok Sabha Secretariat. The Committee also viewed the CCTV footage of Parliament House Estate pertaining to the incident, as furnished by the Parliament Security Service (PSS).

5. The Committee at their third sitting held on 27 July, 2016 examined on oath the Additional Director (Security), In-charge of the Parliament Iron Gate -I (Vijay Chowk Side).

6. The Committee at their fourth sitting held on 28 July, 2016 perused the comments of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP submitted earlier in the day and thereafter examined him on oath.

7. The Committee at their fifth sitting held on 01 August, 2016 perused the revised comments furnished by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP and examined him again, on oath. Thereafter, the Committee after some deliberations felt that they need to examine some more witnesses and also require more time to dwell at length on some critical aspects concerning the subject and hence would not be in a position to

submit their Report by the time limit of 03 August, 2016. The Committee accordingly authorised the Chairperson to take up the matter with the Speaker, Lok Sabha for two weeks extension of time. On a request being so made by Chairperson, Speaker, Lok Sabha, considering the grounds cited, granted extension of two week's more time.

8. The Committee on 4 August, 2016 undertook an on the spot inspection between Vijay Chowk and Iron Gate No.-I of Parliament House Estate and from Iron Gate No.-I of Parliament House to Building Gate No. 1 of the House as per the route taken by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP to reach Parliament House on 21 July, 2016. They held interaction with the officials of Delhi Police who manage the security of the areas outside Parliament House Estate.

9. The Committee at their sixth sitting held on 10 August, 2016 took evidence of the Parliamentary Security Staff who were on duty at Main Building Gate No.-1 PH, when Shri Bhagwant Mann entered the Parliament House through this gate on 21 July, 2016. They also had a briefing from Joint Secretary (Security), Lok Sabha Secretariat on the security measures in Parliament House Estate. The Committee also decided to seek further extension of time to submit their Report by the last day of the first week of the next session *i.e.*, the tenth session of Lok Sabha which was agreed to by the Speaker.

10. The Committee at their seventh sitting held on 23 August, 2016 took evidence of the Deputy Secretary who is incharge of the Parliamentary Notice Office (PNO), Lok Sabha Secretariat, wherein Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP had videographed the procedure of processing of the Zero Hour notices. The Committee, thereafter, was further briefed by the Joint Secretary (Security) on the corrective measures which are required to plug the loopholes to contain the damage and ensure that such incidents do not recur.

11. The Committee at their eighth sitting held on 21 September, 2016 had further briefing from Shri Alok Kumar Verma, Commissioner of Police, Delhi on the further inputs received by them and actions planned to tackle such situations and to deal with threats which may emanate from anti-national elements to the Parliament House Estate and its occupants.

12. The Committee at their ninth sitting held on 10 November, 2016 had a briefing from Shri Vikram Srivastava, IPS (Retd.), former DG CRPF and a Security Expert about the likely short and long term damage caused by the incident of videography done by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP and how to deal with such incidents in future.

13. The Committee at their tenth sitting held on 17 November, 2016 deliberated on the issue of seeking further extension of time to submit their Report. As per permission granted by the Speaker, the Committee were to submit their Report by the deadline of Friday, 18 November, 2016 *i.e.*, the last day of the first week of the tenth session of Lok Sabha. However, the Committee were not in a position to meet the said deadline and therefore, met to seek extension of time from Speaker to

submit their Report. During deliberations, the Committee agreed to seek two week's more time from the Speaker to submit their Report. In case the extension of time was acceded to by the Speaker, the Committee agreed to give one more opportunity to Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP to clarify his position in the given incident and also submit any further submissions in writing if he so desired. As per the request made by the Chairperson in this regard, the Speaker, Lok Sabha was pleased to grant two weeks more time to the Committee to submit their Report and she made an announcement to this effect in the House on 18 November, 2016 at 1200 hrs.

14. As Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP could not appear before the Committee at their eleventh sitting on 22 November, 2016 due to his prior engagements the Committee deferred his evidence to their next sitting on 28 November, 2016.

15. The Committee at their 12th sitting on 28 November, 2016 further examined Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP on oath and thereafter, directed the Secretariat to put up a draft Report for their consideration.

16. The Committee at their last sitting held on 29 November, 2016 considered the draft Report and authorized the Chairperson to take all necessary steps to finalize the Report and present the same to the Speaker and thereafter to the House.

II. Facts of the case

17. On 21 July, 2016 it came to notice that a video recording was purportedly done by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP earlier in the day. The video recorded his entry in the Parliament House (PH), through Iron Gate No. 1 (PH), Building Gate No. 1 (PH) to the Parliamentary Notice Office along with a running commentary, which was live-streamed by him on the facebook. The video along with the commentary *inter alia* not only showed the security arrangements but also explained how they operate and regulate the entry of vehicles to Parliament House Estate. On 22 July, 2016, several Members of Lok Sabha gave notices of question of privilege against Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP for his act of unauthorized video recording of security arrangements of Parliament House Estate etc. and bringing it in public domain by posting it on social media. The Members alleged that Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP by his irresponsible act had caused breach of security of the Parliament House Estate and exposed the security arrangements in public domain and thus exhibited a conduct unbecoming of a Member and therefore demanded appropriate action against him. The Members further alleged that the act of Shri Mann besides jeopardising the security of the Parliament and its Members will help the anti-national elements and it amounts to a contempt of the House. The Members also questioned his motive and intent in this regard. Further, Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab, MP *vide* his separate complaint dated 22 July, 2016 alleged that Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP has violated provisions of Rule 334A of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business and Direction 124A of the Directions by the Speaker, Lok Sabha by giving prior publicity to his notice of Zero Hour. The incident was also sought to be raised in the House by members by way of Notices of Adjournment Motion and Notices for Suspension of Question Hour.

The matter was raised by Members in the House on 22 July, 2016 when the House met at 1100 hrs. and later when it re-assembled at 1200 hrs. Before the House adjourned for the day due to pandemonium on this issue, the Speaker made the following observation:—

"I have received notices of question of privilege, dated 22 July, 2016 from Sarvashri Prem Singh Chandumajra, Nishikant Dubey, Prahlad Singh Patel, Ram Charitra Nishad, Janardan Singh Sigriwal, Rajendra Agrawal, Maheish Girri, Om Birla, Sudhir Gupta, Rakesh Singh, Sushil Kumar Singh, Prof. Chintamani Malviya, Dr. Kirit Somaiya, Dr. Ravindra Kumar Ray, Dr. Sanjay Jaiswal and Dr. Udit Raj, MPs against Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP for unauthorisedly exposing the security arrangements of Parliament House Estate in public and conducting himself in a manner unbecoming of a Member. Further, I have also received a complaint dated 22 July, 2016 under Rule 334A of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business from Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab, MP against Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP. I have also received notices of Adjournment Motion from Sarvashri Uday Pratap Singh, Bhartruhari Mahtab and Rajesh Ranjan on the subject. Sarvashri Chandrakant Khaire, Anandrao Adsul and Dr. Srikant Eknath Shinde have sought to raise the issue immediately after suspending the Question Hour. But the matters are under my consideration and I will take a decision. I feel that it is a serious matter for Parliament security for which 13 persons had sacrificed their lives."

18. Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP meanwhile submitted a written apology dated 22 July, 2016¹ to Speaker, wherein he stated as under:—

"On 21 July, 2016, I came to give notice of Zero Hour and unknowingly videographed the security and other related arrangements. My purpose was not to put the parliamentary security arrangements under threat. I wanted to make people aware of the procedure of asking questions. I tender unconditional apology on this matter. I also respect the temple of democracy and will never like to bring disgrace to this biggest temple of democracy."

19. On 25 July, 2016, when the House met the Speaker Lok Sabha made the following observation:—

"Hon. Members, as you are aware on 22 July, 2016 several Members of the House raised the matter of the serious breach of security of the Parliament House by the improper conduct of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP by videographing and posting critical footage of Parliament House Estate on a social media. I had also expressed my serious concerns in this regard. The Parliament is the *sanctum sanctorum* of democracy. Our Parliament was attacked in 2001 and thirteen security men and parliamentary personnel had sacrificed their lives to protect us. After the attack, the security arrangements for the Parliament were reviewed and the complete security apparatus, security systems and procedures have been completely overhauled to secure the Parliament.

¹Appendix-I.

The act of the Member of audio visual recording of the Parliament and posting it on the social media puts the security of the Parliament in peril. In the light of the serious security implications and consequences of these actions, I had given an assurance to the House that I will look into the matter. In view of the extreme gravity of the matter, I have discussed it with the Leaders of political parties in Lok Sabha and all of them have unanimously agreed to the course of action, I propose to take. I have decided to constitute a nine Member Inquiry Committee to probe this incident and submit its Report. The Inquiry Committee shall inquire into the serious security implications and related aspects germane to and arising out of the conduct of audio visual recording around Parliament House Estate and in the installations situated within the Parliament House by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP on 21 July, 2016 and subsequent uploading of the said audio visual recording by him on social media, (ii) suggest suitable remedial measures to avoid recurrence of such incidents in future; and, (iii) recommend appropriate action in the matter. The concerned Member will be asked to submit his statement or explanation regarding the matter by 1030 hrs., on 26 July, 2016 before the Inquiry Committee. The Inquiry Committee will consist of the following hon. Members: Dr. Kirit Somaiya, Chairperson; Shri Anandrao Adsul, Shrimati Meenakashi Lekhi, Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab, Dr. (Smt.) Ratna De (Nag), Shri Thota Narasimham, Dr. Satya Pal Singh, Shri K.C. Venugopal, and Dr. P. Venugopal. The Committee is requested to examine the matter expeditiously and submit its Report not later than 3 August 2016. **The Committee is authorized to follow its own procedure. The Report of the Committee will be presented to the House for its consideration. In view of the seriousness of the matter, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP is advised not to attend the sittings of the House until a decision is taken in the matter."**

20. Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP *vide* his letter dated 26 July, 2016, while seeking extension of time for filing his reply before the Committee, submitted:—

“ have been accused of breach of Parliament Security and I have been directed to furnish my comments on 26 July, 2016 before the Committee, in this regard. In view of the notice, I request your goodself that I may please be provided atleast 3 days of time so that I can prepare my reply. Secondly, I may kindly be provided video of Virtual Tour of Lok Sabha on official website www.loksabha.nic.in. Thirdly, according to the notice, I have been directed to not attend the House till 3 August, 2016. In this regard I want to assure you that I will honour the decision of the Hon'ble Speaker and will not attend the proceeding of the House. I again request your goodself that I may kindly be allowed three days of time to admit. Hoping positive reply.”

21. The Committee while acceding to the request had directed the Secretariat to communicate to Shri Mann that he may furnish his comments alongwith all the supporting documents and evidence relied upon, by 28 July, 2016 and also appear before the Committee for deposition later in the day.

22. Subsequently *vide* his further communication dated 27 July, 2016 Shri Mann put forth a request as follows:—

"I request the Committee to kindly permit me to bring my Counsel (Shri Rahul Mehra) along with me tomorrow to put forward my case. My request may kindly be placed before the Committee. Thanking you in anticipation."

The Committee at their sitting held on 27 July, 2016 took up for consideration the request made by Shri Mann. In this context the Committee took note of provision of Rule 271 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, which reads as follows:—

"A Committee may, under the direction of the Speaker, permit a witness to be heard by a counsel appointed by the witness and approved by the Committee."

The Committee also took note of past precedents in this regard. After some deliberation, the Committee arrived at the view that since the purpose of asking Shri Mann to appear in person before the Committee was to have first hand account of his version, it would be appropriate that he alone appears before the Committee on 28 July, 2016. The Committee authorised the Chairperson to place the matter before Speaker, Lok Sabha. The Chairperson accordingly placed the matter before the Speaker, Lok Sabha on 27 July, 2016 *inter alia* stating that the request of Shri Mann cannot be acceded to. At the sitting of the Committee on 28 July, 2016, the Chairperson at the outset appraised the Members of the Committee that the Speaker Lok Sabha, has concurred with the position taken by the Committee in the matter as it is authorised to follow its own procedure.

23. Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP furnished his reply² to the Committee on 28 July, 2016 and also appeared before the Committee on the same day and was examined on oath. The Committee found his reply full of contradictions and based on conjectures and surmises and lacked clarity. The Committee therefore granted a further opportunity to the Member to revise or amend his comments, if he so desires, and submit it within two days. The Committee also decided to further hear him again at their next sitting on 01 August, 2016. The link of the web video 'Virtual tour of Lok Sabha' was provided to Shri Mann by the Committee Secretariat on 29 July, 2016.

24. The Committee at their sitting held on 1 August, 2016 further examined Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP in the light of the revised comments furnished by him earlier in the day. The Committee after perusal of the reply³ dated 01 August, 2016 found that there was no change in the stand of Shri Mann *vis-a-vis* his earlier reply dated 28 July, 2016. The Committee also took stock of the pending work to be completed by them by 3 August, 2016, as per the time granted to them by the Speaker, Lok Sabha. The Committee, keeping in view the pending work, decided to seek further extension

²Appendix-II.

³Appendix-III.

of time from the Speaker for a period of two weeks for submitting their Report. The Committee authorised the Chairperson to take up the matter with Speaker in this regard. The Chairperson accordingly requested Speaker for extension of two week's more time. The Speaker after due consideration acceded to the request and made the following observation in the House on 3 August, 2016 :—

“Hon. Members, as you may recall, on 25 July, 2016 I made an announcement in the House regarding constitution of a nine-Member Inquiry Committee to probe into the incident of serious breach of security of the Parliament House by the improper conduct of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP by videographing and posting critical footage of Parliament House Estate on a social media. The Committee was requested to submit its Report not later than 3 August, 2016. I have since received a request from Dr. Kirit Somaiya, Hon. Chairperson of the Inquiry Committee submitting that in view of gravity of the matter the unanimous view among Members of the Committee was that for doing justice to the remit of the Committee, they need some more time as some more witnesses have to be examined and certain critical issues have to be examined in depth.

The Chairperson has, therefore, sought extension of time for further two weeks. On due consideration of grounds and reasons stated, I have acceded to the request for extension of two weeks more time with effect from 4 August, 2016. As earlier observed by me, in view of seriousness of matter Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP is further advised not to attend the sittings of the House until a decision is taken in the matter.”

25. The Committee on 4 August, 2016 undertook a field visit to inspect the route taken by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP while videographing the Parliament House Estate in the morning of 21 July, 2016 and its posting on the social media. The Committee during the inspection were briefed about the security arrangements in and around Parliament House Estate by the Joint Secretary (Security) Lok Sabha Secretariat and the officers and staff of the Parliament Security Service (PSS) who were accompanied by the officers of Parliament Duty Group (PDG) of the CRPF and a team of Delhi Police officials headed by the DCP, New Delhi District, Delhi. The Committee also inspected the working of the security mechanism in place at Iron Gate No. 1 (Vijay Chowk side) for regulating the entry of vehicles and its occupants to the Parliament House Estate through this gate.

26. The Committee on 10 August, 2016 took Evidence of the Parliamentary Security Staff on duty on 21 July, 2016 at Main Building Gate No. 1. Thereafter, the Committee in view of the unfinished work again sought for further extension of time for presentation of the Report and the same was acceded to by the Speaker. The Committee were granted time till the last day of the first week of the next Session. As the session had adjourned *Sine die* on 12 August, 2016 the decision of the Speaker was published in Bulletin Part-II dated 18 August, 2016 (Para No. 4059).

27. The Committee at their next sitting held on 23 August, 2016 heard the Deputy Secretary, and in-charge of Parliamentary Notice Office (PNO), Lok Sabha

Secretariat where the Member had videographed and live streamed the procedure of the processing of the Zero Hour notices on 21 July, 2016. Thereafter, the Committee had a briefing from Shri Yogesh Deshmukh, Joint Secretary (Security), Lok Sabha Secretariat about the modalities to further strengthen the security apparatus in the Parliament House Estate with a view to accord maximum security cover to the Estate and its occupants. After the sitting as desired the Deputy Secretary, PNO also submitted a written statement for consideration of the Committee.

28. The Committee at their sitting held on 21 September, 2016 had further interaction with the Commissioner of Police, Delhi on the further inputs received by them and steps being initiated to tackle such situations and to deal with threats. The Committee directed the Commissioner of Police to furnish written replies to those queries to which he was not in a position to reply immediately. The Committee also expressed their desire to hear views of some security experts in the matter so as to enrich themselves about the extent of damage which may have been caused by the disclosure in public of the security arrangements of Parliament by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP.

29. At the sitting of the Committee on 10 November, 2016 Shri Vikram Srivastava, IPS (Retd.), former DG CRPF and a security expert briefed the Committee about the likely fall out of the revelation of such critical information relating to access to Parliament House in public domain, that too by a Member of Parliament.

30. As the Committee had to submit their Report as per the time limit granted by Speaker i.e., by Friday, 18 November, 2016 (last day of the first week of the tenth session of the Lok Sabha), the Committee met on 17 November, 2016 to assess the quantum of unfinished work and to decide as to how much more time they would require to complete the assigned task. Some Members expressed a view to grant another opportunity to Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP to explain his position, if he so desires. After thorough deliberations, the Committee decided to seek further extension for two week's from Speaker, Lok Sabha to complete the remaining tasks and submit their Report to the House. The Committee also agreed to give one more opportunity to Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP to appear before the Committee and submit further written submission, if he so desired. As authorized by the Committee the Chairperson requested the Speaker for two weeks more time which was acceded to by the Speaker and an announcement in this regard was made in the House on 18 November, 2016 at 1200 noon, *inter alia* directing the Committee to submit their Report by 02 December, 2016.

31. The Committee again met on 22 November, 2016 as decided to further hear Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP in the matter. However, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP by his e-mail message received earlier in the day informed that "*I have already presented before the Committee my detail submission and reply. I do not wish to amend, alter or add anything to my submission. I request to the Committee that kindly treat my previously made submissions as final and adjudicate accordingly.*" He further orally, while seeking confirmation of the receipt of his e-mail on telephone informed the Committee Secretariat that in case the Committee still desires to hear him, he is

willing to appear on any day after 26 November, 2016. The e-mail sent by the Member was circulated to the Committee and his willingness to appear before the Committee after 26 November, 2016 was also informed to the Committee by the Chairperson. The Committee after deliberations were of the considered view that there are certain issues on which clarification are still required from Shri Mann and therefore, his personal appearance before the Committee is needed. The Committee directed that Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP may be asked to appear before it on Monday, 28 November, 2016 and thereafter, the Committee may discuss the draft Report in the matter on Tuesday, 29 November, 2016.

32. Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP appeared before the Committee at its sitting held on 28 November, 2016. The Committee examined him on oath and sought certain clarifications from him. Thereafter, after some deliberations Shri Mann partially withdrew his replies submitted before the Committee on 28 July, 2016 and 01 August, 2016. The Committee after some deliberations directed the Secretariat to put up a draft Report for their consideration at their next sitting.

33. The Committee at their last sitting held on 29 November, 2016 discussed the draft Report and Members gave their suggestions. The Committee after detailed deliberations authorized the Chairperson to take consequential action to finalize the Report in the light of suggestions made by the Members and present the same to the Speaker and the House.

34. Subsequent to the sitting of the Committee held on 29 November, 2016 wherein the Committee authorized the Chairperson to finalize the Report and present the same to Speaker and to lay it before the House, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP was asked to furnish in writing, his revised stand/reply, as per the assurance given by him during his last deposition before the Committee on 28 November, 2016. As Shri Mann could not furnish the same by 02 December, 2016, the date by which the Committee were required to submit their Report to the Speaker, the Chairperson requested the Speaker for grant of one week's more time to submit the Report. The Speaker acceded to the request and granted further extension of time and directed the Committee to submit their Report by 09 December, 2016 vide her observation on 02 December, 2016.

III. Evidence

Evidence of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP

35. During his Evidence before the Committee on 28 July, 2016 Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP *inter alia* explained his position in the matter as follows:—

“Hon'ble Chairperson and Members Sir, I had asked for 3 days of time. Earlier I wanted to come on 25 July and I requested you by writing a letter and I thank you for giving me 3 days of time. Today, I received an e-mail from Privilege and Ethics Branch wherein I was asked to submit written reply by eleven o' clock, which I had submitted before eleven. I said it that day also that media is broadcasting these things as well. First of all I would like to say that I had

no intention at all to make this video and I do not want to breach security of Parliament which is highest temple of democracy and where I sit myself. My intention was to make people aware as to how matters related to Zero Hour are submitted from 8.30 to 9 o' clock and how a notice of lucky draw is processed transparently at 9.00 o' clock in front of all people, PA's and officers. My intention was limited to that only. My intention was not to breach any security and to provide confidential information and I have no such intention even today. When you people opposed this matter in House then I went to Madam Speaker's Chamber and I said that it happened unknowingly. I was not aware that this is breach of security. I did not know and that is why it happened unknowingly and I submitted written apology to Madam Speaker, wherein I wrote that I uploaded a video on facebook by my making a clip from mobile on 21 July from Building Gate No. 1 passing through Notice Office during submission of notice related to Zero Hour and my intention was only to make people aware by making an educational video because when we visit constituency then people say that you had promised to raise this issue in Parliament and then we say that we had submitted these matters in Zero Hour. State matters are raised in Zero Hour. I say that I had submitted your request but it did not come in lucky draw. They ask about lucky draw and say that you are telling lie. I made this video only for that purpose, otherwise I would not have. Not that this is breach of security. I had given unconditional written apology for this act committed by me. I am a patriot and I respect Parliament where I sit and I had given my written apology to Madam Speaker not to commit such act in future. I heard on Monday that I have been instructed not to participate in sittings of House till 3 August, 2016 and I respect it. Even today I did not visit House and returned back. I came to you at three o'clock. That apology was not considered enough and a Committee has been constituted comprising you people and I am present before you. I heard from TV debates that I have been linked with ISI, Afzal Guru and Hadley. What type of confidential documents did I show. I feel that my patriotism is being questioned. I have also written another letter to Madam Speaker that the Government had guided ISI officers properly to recce the Pathankot airbase they breached security. So I submit to widen the jurisdiction of this Committee to look into that matter as well, if my video is being associated with ISI."

36. The Committee noted the presence of extraneous facts in the reply of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP which seemingly do not have any relevance in the instant matter. On this being pointed out to him by the Committee, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP stated:—

"I have given an example in last para of page number four that Shri Vijendra Pal Singh, the then Member of Parliament of BJP entered in Parliament House in his Mercedes car by affixing fake stickers. He also faced Ethics Committee and said that he wanted to show loopholes in security and he was pardoned. I am however, not able to do so now."

37. When the Committee requested the Member to confine his pleadings to the instant case, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP replied:—

“I have told regarding this case only. I had no such intention. Today also before you and before House, I have started with unconditional apology. If you see the second page, I have tendered humble and unconditional apology. I say right now I can give it in writing also. I am ready to beg an apology in House also. I had no intention to degrade the dignity of House. Hon'ble MPs are my brothers, sisters and colleagues. I don't want to put their lives in danger and give any such evidence to the enemy which can lead an attack on Parliament be it Lok Sabha or Rajya Sabha which is also known as biggest temple of democracy or biggest Panchayat of the country. I have great regard for those who laid down their lives in 2001 while saving Parliament. I see those bullet marks daily. Their photographs are framed in Parliament Library Building. I respect them. I had no intention to lower the dignity of their sacrifice or make a fun of it. I am sorry to note that even after my apology, Madam Speaker has ordered this. Whatever she orders I am ready to obey. I do not want to rebel or something like that. I am your colleague. I have been elected by five and half lakh people. I only wanted transparency. I always appreciate Madam Speaker and quote her in my speeches that she is trying to bridge the gap between people and Parliament. This video is a part of that effort. I am first timer. You people are my seniors. If something has happened unintentionally if you see it as a breach of security then I am offering unconditional apology. If you want it in writing, I am ready to do so. I can submit it anywhere even in House. I neither intend nor have this intention not even in future. I want to raise the dignity of this House. Our country is biggest democracy of the world and we should raise its dignity. My submission is to lessen the gap between people and temple of democracy.”

38. On being asked whether he had sought prior permission to videograph the Parliament House premises, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP replied:—

“I was not aware of the fact that I have to take permission for that because I have not seen any board indicating that videography is prohibited here or you cannot carry your mobile phone along with. Had I known that I have to take permission for that I could have applied for permission. I had come here in my registered vehicle and my driver also had permission to come inside. Whatever I am telling I am telling in Punjabi. If you have heard the video then you will be aware that I am telling in video that the security is very tight and it should be in that way because this is Parliament of India. I was appreciating the fact that security is very strict and it should be strict. We often see the visuals of the route from Vijay Chowk to Gate No. 1. I have provided the link of one such video. You can see that. NDTV has shown all the details of Gate no. 1 in its report telecasted the same day between 0830 to 9 o'clock. Had I known that I am doing anything wrong then I would have never repeated that I will come again tomorrow. I will come back tomorrow means I come here

daily. You can summon the officials of Notice Office and ask them whether I come daily or not. Perhaps all other MPs send their PAs but I come here personally, be it bad weather or any other hurdle. I come here daily because it is my passion to raise the question of those who have elected and sent me here.”

39. When the Committee asked as to what the Member had felt about this incident in retrospect, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP stated:—

“I asked and tendered unconditional apology because I committed this mistake unknowingly. If I would have done it knowingly, I would feel guilty. I have been elected first time to this House and I tendered apology that this has all happened unknowingly. In this regard, I should have shown some maturity. I assure you that such mistake will not recur in future. I would like to give an example, once I was watching my phone in the House, an officer from Table Office alerted me saying that photography is prohibited here. However, I was not taking any photograph but I was only checking my mobile phone. Afterwards, I never checked my mobile phone in the House.. .this happened only unknowingly. I never intended either to set any new precedent or breach the security of the country.”

40. On being asked about his reaction to his alleged statements in the media about his intention to videograph the parliamentary premises again, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP stated:—

“Until that time I was not aware that I had committed a mistake. Had I known, I would have never committed it. You can very well imagine my intention from this very fact. When I told that I would come tomorrow also in the same manner, it means I would do it every day. I come everyday. I didn't say that I will make it live tomorrow. I would apply for it again tomorrow, I would make a submission tomorrow again. I intended to show that I try to raise issues. Only those 20 members whose names are balloted would get an opportunity to present their views before the House and other Members will not get chance to speak out their views. Had I known that it is wrong then why should I say that I would repeat the same. When I realised that it is illegal I didn't repeat the same afterwards. Even today I put before you that I am ready to give anything in writing on the point.”

41. To a specific query as to what was his intention behind uploading the video on the social media: whether it was out of curiosity or was it a deliberate and planned attempt, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP replied:—

“Sir, nowadays we express our views on the social media in a transparent manner. When I move out of my house I go on live with the people while sitting. Recently, it has started that you can sit live on Facebook and receive live comment from people. Smt. Meenakashiji understands Punjabi. I am saying in that (video) that people are supreme in democracy. This is for the masses. How we raise the people's problem here and how the questions are submitted.

I have not shown the close up of the question of anyone as to what question was asked by whom. I have not committed this breach of privacy. That day, I had taken the ballot process on my own and my mobile was not towards the box. I was picking the ballot papers up and announcement was going on. My intention was only to tell the people as to how it is picked up and the staff comes between 8:00 and 9:00 in the morning for the job. This was my intention. My intention was not to draw any publicity or doing any act to jeopardize the security.”

42. On being enquired whether he was asked by any security person or any other officer of Secretariat to stop the videography, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP stated:—

“Had any security person asked me I would have stopped doing so immediately. Had somebody told me on the gate that it was wrong and you are doing a photoshoot taking mobile in your hand then I would have stopped doing it. I have never done so. Even on toll tax they stop us, as we don't use red light beacon (on vehicles). They say that we have no red light, then we say that we have Identity Card. They say that they do not see Identity Card and see only red light. I tell them that this is my Identity Card and you show it to your supervisor and I can wait for 15 minutes for the same. I satisfy them. Sir, I did not know about this as I was making a commentary alongside. If anyone had said that you should not do this or someone had stopped me, I would have immediately stopped doing that. My intention was to make a video for information and after that I stopped it there itself. I did not upload it on social media, it was running live.

If at that time anyone would have suggested me not to do that or even a security person would have prohibited me from doing that I would have stopped immediately. If I had made it inspite of security prohibition, then I would consider myself wrong. Had there been a sign that mobiles are not allowed here or videography is not allowed here, then I would not have done that. It happened unintentionally. If even a single security person would have said I would have stopped. You can see that in my video. In that I say, these are security men, this is my sticker. If someone had told me there I would have deleted it. My driver also had the pass.”

43. On being pointed out that he ought to have shown sense of responsibility in the matter, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP stated:—

“I did it in ignorance. Had I been aware about it and still I would have done that then I would have immediately accepted that I am guilty. Still, I will accede and follow whatever your decision in the matter is. Had it been my intention to breach safety or had I recorded it for someone, I would not upload it on facebook. In case I had to provide information to some particular person with wrong intentions, I would have made it secretly. Media shows

Gate No. 1 daily and you come and go from there only. It was not my intention to show any secret chamber from where it is done rather I had asked for a video of virtual tour which I could not get. That video was on www.loksabha.nic.in only 3-4 days back. It was a link to virtual tour in which a video of complete internal working has been shown. It was on the website till two three days back, now they are saying there is technical problem in that. I had asked for it and you had accorded permission to give me that, but it has not been given to me. Virtual tour uploaded on Lok Sabha website shows everything. I only went upto notice office and stopped it there. I agree that it could have been avoided. It was not a compulsory act for me hence it was avoidable. May be future MPs will learn a lesson from this incident. I feel guilty as I have been advised not to attend the House till 3 August; had I not done this, may be I could have got chance to speak today in the House on the issue of inflation.”

44. When asked as to what remedial steps does he propose to take from his side in the matter, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP stated:—

“Sir I keep on learning from my seniors, but that day suddenly that idea came into my mind and that is why I did not argue on the matter, I went to the room of the Hon'ble Speaker and said that I did that in ignorance and I will accept whatever punishment you give, I respect the Parliament, she said do not attend the House till third of August. You know that I always speak in the House on every issue, but I am just watching the inflation topic being discussed in the House on TV and I feel if I had not done that then today I too would have been speaking in the House on the issue of inflation, about my state, about the people of my constituency. It was avoidable. I keep on listening to my seniors and whatever weak points I have, I try to improve and correct myself. As you are my seniors and have been here since long may be I cannot understand that much in one term. It is a vast institution and it may take time to understand its dignity. But it never was my intention to downgrade or insult the dignity of Lok Sabha. I again submit that it happened because this is my first term in the House and I am from a nonpolitical background. My parents or grandfather did not explain to me as to how one should sit over there. I took six months to learn as to where and how should I sit and how to mark attendance there. In the beginning I used to forget marking attendance. Later, I came to know that there was a register in which we had to mark attendance. I had a passion to speak and represent the people. Whenever I speak I go to the Audio-Visual section and take CD after paying Rs. 100/- and watch the same to see the issue which was raised by me. I tell them to confirm if there is any expunction or unparliamentary term because there was an uproar in the House today. I ask them to take permission, from their Branch, in case Madam has ordered to expunge something, I will take the CD tomorrow but I will not ask them to give CD as there was no expunction from my speech today. **I follow the Rules but here I have made a mistake.**”

45. When the Committee asked when did he realise that he has committed a breach of security by his act of videography and uploading it on the social media, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP submitted:—

“I came to know through media in the evening of 21 July. I came to know through media that Bhagwant Mann has committed this breach of security. They showed all this. In the next morning I came to give my request for zero hour. It was 22. I also came on 22 July but I did not do anything as such. Media persons came to me and asked if I was going to do this then I told that I would not do so.”

46. When the Committee enquired about the steps taken by him to control the damage caused by his act to the Parliament as an Institution, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP replied:—

“In the evening I spoke to my party and they said that I can never do like this and asked me to go to the House and see what happens over there. There was uproar in the House and when House was adjourned for one hour at around 11.05 I went to the Madam Speaker's Chamber, though I was not called and said that I wish to tender unconditional apology for this act and I have committed this mistake unknowingly. Madam told that I had committed a big mistake. Think of those martyrs who laid lives in Parliament attack. I said that it was never my intention to insult the martyrdom of those martyrs or anything like this immediately I rushed to the Steno Pool and prepared a written explanation and came back. I could not meet Madam Speaker this time as the House was adjourned till Monday, but I gave it in the Notice Office. As a wrong date was mentioned by mistake in my letter, I corrected it later in the chamber of Private Secretary to Madam Speaker and then I went to my constituency.”

47. When the Committee pointedly asked the member as to why he has alluded names of higher dignitaries in his reply furnished to the Committee, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP stated:—

“Madam, when this issue was associated with ISI and my comparison was made with Afzal Guru then I said that if it is happening due to my video then there are other examples also. Then I quoted this incident of Shri Vijendra Pal. This is why I did so. Again it was said that if this video was made for ISI, then they are coming to our country. This is why I quoted it as an example. I feel, if it is a breach of security then there are other examples also which deserve to be brought under this jurisdiction, which is why I gave the example.”

48. On being asked as to whether he has to submit anything else in the matter, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP submitted:—

“I say it again that it was done unintentionally and unknowingly. If it would have been my intention then may be I would not have done this and I would not do so in future. I assure you that I will never do so in future. So long as

people will send me to the Parliament or I will remain here it would never be repeated in future. Whenever I get a chance I will mention in my speech that I tender my unconditional apology if I have committed any breach of security. If you ask me to say this on record in the House, I am ready to do so. Had I known about the security at the gate, the same might be open even now, people may be passing through this and may be even public transport is passing and announcements are made very loudly over there. Had I known that it is allowed upto notice office only then I would have done in notice office only. I was not aware of this fact. Unintentionally and unknowingly I did so, as I was going there. I would write this and a number of people are always there but I did not breach the privacy of anybody. I felt that media shows visuals upto the stairs everyday and it is already known to each and every person that we come to the House at around 8.30 or 8.50 in the morning. I started from South Avenue at 8.50. I started my camera at Vijay Chowk. I did not put it on from my house. Even in that I was saying that it is very tight security here and it should be so because it is the Parliament of the country. This is heart of the country. As I made it inside I ended it inside. I did not try to mention the name or close up of any officer. I only said that these are the officers. I only said that there are the officers who come here at 8.00 in the morning and they contribute a lot in running the democratic system. I was saying that.”

49. Reiterating the position / stand taken by him Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP during his further evidence on 1 August, 2016 *inter alia* stated as follows:—

“Sir as you have said that I may edit or amend the reply furnished to the Committee earlier, hence I did an introspection. I could not say anything more in my defence. My reply is the same as I had furnished earlier except the date. The date of my reply has been changed to 1 August, which I had submitted on 28 July, 2016. Apart from this I do not wish to say anything in my defence. Although two-three points have come to my notice that a person entered the Parliament posing as Shatrughan Sinha, but I do not wish to further elaborate in this regard since you have said that such examples should not be cited in this regard.

Sir this is what I have to say in my defence because it was not my intention. But, if my name is linked with ISI by saying that the said act may be beneficial for ISI then I will give examples. For me, security of the country is supreme, irrespective of the status of a person.

Sir, before I submit my point I would like to submit about security of Parliament. Shri Vijendra Pal Singh was Member of Parliament. Two cars entered the Parliament having the same number and both cars have similar stickers and when he was summoned before the Committee, he replied that he wanted to show loopholes of security system, hence he was pardoned. I can cite the examples of all the incidents regarding breach of security which have taken place so far. How can you stop me to cite such examples. If you want to ask in

respect of my case then you should go to reception gate. There, number of the car entering the Parliament House is being announced, hence thousands of people would have been listening the said announcement. The whole process is being recorded there. I have neither showcased any hidden or secret door nor taken any unauthorised person inside the Parliament. My intention was to bring people closer to democracy. The Hon'ble Committee will decide whether they consider my reply correct or not.

Hon'ble Meenakashi Lekhi ji was asking me to handover it (my mobile) with my reply. I have not killed anyone. It is not a weapon used in the crime which has been recovered. There are certain private videos and photos in it; atleast don't consider me as an accused though I have been referred as witness, but I am still a sitting Member of Parliament, not a former Member. It is a different point that I may become former Member of Parliament, if the Committee make such report in this case. But my intention was to bring people closer to democracy and bring transparency as Hon'ble Madam Speaker always emphasised on it in meetings. You may consider it as a point of such initiative as everything has been showcased in video of virtual tour (of Lok Sabha). I have confined my recording to the Notice Office. I do not wish to put security of Parliament under threat, where I sit and where Hon'ble Members, my brothers and sisters are present. As far as unconditional apology is concerned, you must have read it in my reply that I have submitted my written apology before 2 PM the same day when the House was adjourned, to the Private Secretary of Hon'ble Madam Speaker after getting it stamped in Notice Office. I can read out that letter because I have written it and I do remember that when I came to give notice to raise matter during Zero Hour on 21 July, I unknowingly made video on my mobile while entering Parliament and my intention was to make people aware and not to put security of Parliament under threat. I tender my unconditional apology for the same. I cannot tolerate insult of this temple of democracy and I wish that regard for this temple of democracy should be everlasting and I promise you that such incident will not be repeated in future. I have submitted my apology letter to Madam Speaker after 1200 PM on Friday (22.07.2016) when House was adjourned, but I came to know on Monday that I have been advised not to attend House till 3 August and a Nine Member Committee has been constituted which means my unconditional apology was not accepted. Hence, I had to submit my reply, wherein I have cited such examples in my defence.

I want that scope of the Committee should be extended. If the Committee has been constituted in the matter of security then scope of the same should be extended. Sir, it is my final reply for consideration of the Committee."

50. When the Committee asked him whether he can hand over the mobile hand set which was used for video recording of the Parliament House Estate for forensic examination, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP stated:—

“ Whatever footage you have seen is the same which I have recorded. The

footage has not been edited. It was live video. There would be scope to edit the footage had I uploaded the video later.”

51. When the Committee enquired about his being aware of the participation of the Chief Minister of Delhi in the Inter-State Council meet, wherein the Prime Minister was also present and the Chief Minister was not allowed to take his mobile and whether the Member had a talk with the Chief Minister in this context, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP replied:—

“Yes, I am aware of the meeting through press reports but I do not know anything about the Chief Minister not being allowed to take his mobile.. I am not aware of all the rules and I am still in the learning process.. had I talked to anybody I would not have been before you today. Had any senior officer told me. I would not have done this. If I was aware that this was an improper act, why I would have reiterated in the media that I would repeat it. When I realised that I have committed a mistake, I said nothing after that. Yes, I had received a phone call from Kejriwal Ji, in this regard and he told me not to repeat such act again. I told him that I had to go to raise a subject in Zero Hour. He told me to go but advised me not to repeat that act. Till that time I had no inkling that I Committed any mistake. If I were aware I would not have told that I would repeat it. If I was aware of the breach, I would have made a secret video I would not have uploaded it in the facebook. If you see that video, you will notice live comments. I cannot change or delete it.”

52. When the Committee specifically asked him whether he was aware that videography of the Parliament House done by him is unauthorised, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP replied:—

“I want to say that there is no sign board which informs that videography cannot be done here (Parliament House Estate).....It should be.....like this because I may also become a victim of security breach. If I am doing videography where it is not allowed then it is my mistake. If later on, I am informed that it is not allowed, then it may be said that I am not aware of it. I have been a Member of Parliament for the last two years and three months and I have won election for the first time. All the rules may not be known to the Members who have won election for the first time.”

53. When the Committee further specifically asked him about the exposure of security arrangement which can take place from a audio-visual videography in comparison to still photograph, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP submitted:—

“I know about the Airport where videography is not allowed. It is written there but I had no knowledge about that. Every day media takes photograph of gate no. 1. I stopped the video after showing the office where lucky draw is held. If I had any wrong intention, I would have gone here and there. Have you seen virtual tour? Everything is shown there, that it is at a distance of 17 steps, red carpet belongs to Rajya Sabha and green carpet is meant for Lok Sabha. You may enter from here. Here is Central Hall. I had not gone to

such distance. When I am entering even camera is not straight because I myself was entering. Security personnel opened the door. At that point, camera was shaking. After going inside I was saying that I had reached there and I wrote the matter on the pink slip. Stamp will be put on it but I do not know at which number, I will speak. That day, I myself drew the lots. Most of the time I myself draw the lot because I reach the Parliament House by half past eight or at nine in the morning. I like speaking the most. When people say that I am lying as my name does not figure in the lucky draw, they ask what is 'Lucky Draw'. I want that all these processes should be telecast live on Lok Sabha T.V like the issues raised by the MPs and the names of Members who got a chance to speak. As a result we can tell the people that we had attempted to raise the issue but our name did not figure in the lucky draw. Everything is telecast live after 11 o'clock. This should also be telecast live. If it is telecast live why would have I made a video?"

54. When the Committee sought a clarification as to why he did not seek the approval of Hon'ble Speaker for uploading the video live which he terms as an educative one for his constituents, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP clarified:—

“No, I have not written letter to the Speaker. I had tried to make people of my constituency aware to the process by making that video. I felt that all will get familiar with the Parliamentary process but breach of security took place. You are talking about outside, you are not saying anything about inside. Where it is written that making live video is prohibited? Write this, I will not make any. If you have already made an opinion about me then I have no knowledge about that. I had no such intention. Don't enquire in such a way that I have committed a big crime. I am pained that I am being compared with Afzal Guru and Hadely by your spokespersons giving statement in the media. My patriotism is being doubted. This is the most painful thing for me. If it is like this I will not regret even losing the post of the Member of Parliament. I accept that this was avoidable. I agree to this. It was not necessary to show that.”

55. On being asked as to what motivates him to be active on the social media, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP replied:—

“See my facebook page, I have been live on facebook earlier also. This is not for the first time. I had two rallies yesterday night also. I had two rallies, both were live. I even update my status while travelling, that I am going to bow my head, I am going in a rally. I use social media not at the behest of anyone.”

56. The Committee sought to know from the Member whether the statement made by him in his reply that the Prime Minister has to be summoned before the Committee reflects his own sentiments or has been drafted under some influence. In response, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP replied:—

“I have not said that he must be called here. If my name is associated with ISI regarding security breach and it is said that ISI will be benefited from this,

then I may cite example of recent incidents. You may or may not accept it. I cannot say that I'll not come till he is summoned, this is not my condition.”

57. The Committee specifically pointed out to the Member various contradictions in his written submissions dated 28 July, 2016 and 1 August, 2016. In response, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP while disagreeing with this observations of the Committee stated:—

“ It appeared to me that I have not committed any breach of security but if it took place unintentionally, for that I have said it. You all are seniors, have more knowledge about this. If it is so, I extend my unconditional apology. It did not feel so. If I were aware I would not have done it. I did not feel that I have committed any breach of security. But if you feel that I have committed breach of security, then I have given Madam Speaker in writing that the purpose of recording that video was only for knowledge and not to put the security in danger. I have given this in writing.”

58. On being asked as to when did he realise that he had committed a breach of the Parliament security and if so, why did he state in the media that he will repeat the said act on the next day, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP submitted:—

“When in the evening I watched media, it was being highlighted that whatever has happened will also be considered as a breach of security. I told that I don't think so but if I get a notice I will make a reply. I only tried to show the lucky draw procedure. I come every day, I will come tomorrow also. Till then, I didn't know that this is a security breach.”

59. When the Committee enquired as to how many hits his facebook post had received, before it was deleted by him from his account and how many likes he had received from his constituents, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP replied:—

“Sir I have deleted this video from my facebook account in the afternoon of 22 July, 2016. So I am not in a position to say how many people liked it. Sir, I could not check it. How should I know that who is commenting and from where? I want to say that two thousand or three thousand comments come on a live video, I cannot check all of them. Even if I read them, I cannot find where these comments are coming from. If I do something live I will not be able to restrict it to my Parliamentary constituency. May be someone is watching it in Canada or somewhere else? This is social media, what can I do about it?”

60. On being pointed out to the Member that by his act of videography he has explicitly disclosed the limits of receipt of mobile signals etc. in the Parliament House to the public, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP submitted:—

“Jammers do not operate till 09 in the morning. Jammers do not operate from 0830 to 0900 hrs. The jammers start operating after that; our phone does not function in the House. Phones are allowed even to Personal Assistants upto Notice Office. Just as you make a call, you can find the location at your will

through "google earth". Just as you receive the call, you will be able to know that under which tower you are operating. There is everything on virtual tour. Even that portion inside the Parliament is also shown where a garden is located, which even I don't know. I came to know from the *Loksabha.nic.in* that a garden is located inside at the back."

61. To a specific query as to whether any official/staff in the Parliamentary Notice office requested him not to do the videography, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP replied:—

"Only the person putting stamp asked me not to do that. The person who puts stamp on the notices in the Notice Office asked me not to do it. I asked him to put stamp on the notice, he said that anyone coming for getting the notice stamped gets a number like 155 or 156 and this number goes on increasing. Then, I turned my camera other side. He asked not to make a video of stamping process. I turned my camera and he put the stamp. Even I did not know what was my number that day, even though ballot was to be held in my presence. So I didn't ask for my number. It is so because I come early in the morning everyday and in 95% of cases, ballots are held in my presence. No one stopped me. I was asked the same thing that day also. I was speaking at that moment I, therefore, may have not listened to it. If someone had stopped me, I would have turned off my camera and the matter perhaps could not have gone so far."

62. When the Committee asked Shri Bhagwant Mann about the countries visited by him recently he submitted that recently he had not visited any country. Then he corrected himself and stated that he had visited USA (California) this year. When he was further asked as to whether he had visited any other country or stayed abroad for a long duration, he denied. When the Committee further probed him in regard of his foreign visits in the past one or two years he clarified that he had visited Singapore and then Australia in October-November, 2015. Thereafter, when the Committee pointedly asked him whether he had visited Canada then Shri Mann again clarified that yes he had visited Canada around 1 July, 2015.

63. Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP in his last interaction with the Committee on 28 November, 2016 submitted on oath that "He has already offered his unconditional apology to the Hon'ble Speaker in the matter and that he has done the videography unintentionally and unknowingly and only when his written apology was not accepted by the Hon'ble Speaker and this Committee was constituted that he submitted another written reply on 28 July and 01 August, 2016 wherein he referred to certain other examples of security breach in which a lenient view had been taken. He affirmed his faith in the Constitution, the Parliament and democracy and submitted that he is no less a patriot than any other citizen."

64. When the Committee specifically asked him about the contradictions in his letter dated 22 July, 2016 to the Speaker and his subsequent reply submitted to

the Committee on 28 July, 2016 and reiterated by him on 01 August, 2016, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP submitted:—

“Sir I had submitted my apology to the Speaker and I also complied with her advice not to attend and therefore did not attend any sitting of the House since 25 July, 2016. I have not attended any Committee meeting also I have all respect for the Speaker and for this Committee also. I have only requested the Committee that they should also examine other cases where there was breach of security and I did not mean that the persons who had been alluded in my reply should necessarily be summoned by the Committee.”

65. The Chairperson thereupon read out the contents of the letter dated 22 July, 2016 written by Shri Mann, to Speaker Lok Sabha and the reply furnished to the Committee by him and asked for a specific clarification as to whether he is apologetic about his conduct and whether he still stands by the unconditional apology which he had tendered to the Speaker Lok Sabha. To this Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP after due consideration of his reply, stated as under:—

“Only that portion of my letter dated 28 July and 01 August, 2016 which speaks of my unconditional apology be taken on record and other contents of the reply may be treated as withdrawn.”

66. Consequent upon the amends made by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP in the reply furnished to the Committee, the revised version of his reply reads as under:—

“At this juncture, it is imperative to state that I have the highest respect and regard for august institution of Parliament House, its installations and its eminent members, all of whom collectively form the bedrock of our Parliamentary democracy and is a shining testament to and hallmark of our commitment and endeavor to achieve for the common man of this great country, all the rights contemplated under the Constitution of India. I will never intentionally commit any act which will in any manner compromise/jeopardize the security and safety of Parliament House or its members. This was never my intention/objective and assuming for the sake for argument, without admitting that this has been the result of my act, the purpose of which I will allude in the succeeding part of the present reply, I do hereby tender my most humble and unconditional apology.”

Shri Mann submitted that the aforestated version is his final submission and only that may be taken on record and the rest may be treated as withdrawn, to which the Committee agreed.

Evidence of Shri G. S. Guleria, Additional Director (Security)

67 . Explaining the sequence of events that took place on the morning of 21 July, 2016, Shri G. S. Guleria, Additional Director (Security), during his evidence before the Committee on 27 July, 2016, *inter alia* stated as follows:—

“Our duty is at Iron Gate No. 1. Our duty starts at 8 am. I too am therefrom 8 am and all my colleagues come there at 8 am.

Our first part is, when we come from Vijay Chowk side, that is called Iron Gate (IG) 1, BB-1 point. Till 9 am there is single man, after 9 am another point starts and another man is also there that is BB2; for the identification of Hon'ble Members, we have one Security Assistant from Lok Sabha and one from Rajya Sabha. Duty is from 8 am till the House adjourns and after every 2 hours duty persons are changed. We maintain chart and supervisor does the entry work. When House adjourns we go only after making entry in that register. Then we deposit the keys with PDG. IG-1 is the gate which is main gate of our Parliament House. Maximum vehicles, around 400-500 vehicles pass from this gate. Most of the Hon'ble Member(s), Council of Ministers come from that gate only. We identify the member, his/her P.A. and driver who have been issued passes by CPIC and sticker is there on their vehicle and allow the entry to them. Only those people are allowed in that Gate. In case of any request from any Hon'ble Members that goes to our high ups, Joint Secretary or Director, Rajya Sabha Security, if anyone has to be allowed then that information comes from the Control Room. You have seen the system, vehicle comes and the boom barrier at BB 1 will lift and the vehicle will enter. On the BB 2 also there is a monitor inside the LCS box. In the LCS also, we have technical people. They are sitting there alongwith one Delhi Police personnel. One UBS is installed there to see whether there is anything beneath the vehicle. If anything unusual or abnormal is seen there, we stop that vehicle and check it. At our monitor the details of the registered driver, name of the member and if he has taken RF tag, all the details are displayed. Rest is the day to day information about which VIPs are coming. From Iron Gate-1 and around the gate we don't allow any visitor to take pictures. Particularly on holidays, many people come and try to take selfies. We totally restrict them, with the cooperation of Delhi Police also. During sessions, at Jantar Mantar there are many agitations. Sometimes people come through this, you must have observed yourself. I am at this point for last two years, I think only once we have closed this gate for two minutes. We allow entry after minute scrutiny with valid pass and all that. This is my humble submission.”

68. Enquiring about the entry of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP in the Parliament House through Vijay Chowk Gate in the morning of 21 July, 2016 the Committee asked whether he or any of his subordinates noticed or asked the Member not to videograph the entry, the official submitted:—

“With regard to your specific query about the entry of hon. MP, Shri Bhagwant Mann on that day, I was very much at the point — BB 1 — Boom Barrier 1, on the side of Iron Gate No.1. I myself was standing there. He was facing the front side. I was there standing. He came from the Vijay Chowk side. He was in his authorised vehicle, with RF tag, etc. When he came nearby, we wished him. He was holding phone but we could not identify that whether he was videographing or not because there it takes a few seconds on BB 1, when the chip comes, sometimes the chip reads from five feet also, and it takes only a few seconds. He came inside; he was there. We don't have any specific instructions that we can stop the hon. MP with mobile from videographing. On that day also, we have not seen him that he was videographing. We could

not see him videographing. I just said, good morning, and he waved his hands. From now onwards, if such incidents takes place, definitely we would request the MP accordingly.”

69. On being asked about the guidelines if any relating to videography of that particular area, the official submitted:—

“As far as general public is concerned, as I earlier mentioned, many people from far away places come outside the Iron Gate No.1 and try to take selfie. They say that at least allow us to take some pictures of Parliament but Sir, we don't allow them to take photographs from our side *i.e.* IG-1 side. We tell them that you can take photographs from other side, from far away. So far as the MPs are concerned I have never come across such an incident. I have never seen that any MP has videographed.”

70. When the Committee enquired about the presence of other security personnel, besides those of Parliament Security Service at the spot with regard to securing and regulating the entry of MPs to the Parliament House Estate, the official submitted:—

“With regard to Iron Gate No. 1 deployment, we are from Parliament Security Service, both from Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha and along with us there are people from Delhi Police (Traffic) also. Then, we have personnel from Delhi Police (Security) and on both the court yards, (near Iron Gate-1) we have people from State Police forces. The personnel of Delhi Police also remain there. When you go from Vijay Chowk and as you will enter from there. You will find first barrier of Delhi Traffic Police and local Police where armed commandos are always on duty.”

71. To a specific query regarding the process by which the Parliament Security identifies whether a person or vehicle entering the Parliament House is genuine or fake, the official submitted:—

“We identify them with the help of the hologram that we have provided. Hologram is provided on them. The personnel who perform their duties they mostly check that hologram because we have seen that hologram cannot be copied.”

Evidence of Shri Krishan Kumar, Security Officer and Shri Rajnish Kumar Rana, Senior Security Assistant, Lok Sabha Secretariat

72. During their Evidence before the Committee on 10 August, 2016 the above mentioned officials of Parliament Security Service *inter-alia* submitted as follows:—

“Sir, we reported that day between 0830 and 0900 in the morning. I briefed my staff about the points that are to be to manned. Two Security Assistants were on duty on 21 July, 2016 at building Gate No. -1. On that day, after we left for our homes, we saw the news on TV and came to know that such an incident had happened during the day. Next day when we came to office, the news had

been widely reported in the media and we were briefed by our Senior Officers about it and asked to ensure that such an incident is not repeated.”

73. When the Committee asked to narrate the sequence of events that exactly took place at building Gate-1 on 21 July, 2016 when Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP entered the Parliament House, Shri Rajnish Kumar Rana submitted:—

“Sir I was on duty at building Gate No. -1. Generally, during that week, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP came to Parliament House near about 9 am. I could not specially notice as to what he was doing and I came to know about this through media on the next day that such an incident had happened on the previous day. ...Further, Shri Maim deboarded from his vehicle and speedily entered the Parliament House through the stairs. .. I could not find anything suspicious about his movement as normally when he takes the stairs, he carries a mobile phone in his hands and I could not notice whether he was recording or doing something else as he remained silent at that time. ... I could not notice any abnormality in his behavior.”

74. On being enquired as to what instructions they have about the video recordings done by the visitors and MPs near building Gate -1, Shri Rajnish Kumar Rana submitted:—

“Sir for normal visitors we have instructions that they are to be stopped from doing any video-recording and we do stop them also but we do not have any instructions for recordings being done by an Hon'ble MP... Further, there is a requirement for instructions on video recording of the Parliament House to safeguard its security set up and maintain its confidentiality and prevent it from being disclosed.”

75. When asked as to how the security personnel are supposed to react in such situations even when they have no instructions on video-recording done by a MP, Shri Rajnish Kumar Rana submitted:—

“In case a Member is doing video-recording in an unusual manner we will bring it to the knowledge of our Senior Officers... As far as the movement of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP is concerned I did not notice anything unusual about it and it appeared to be normal.”

76. When the Committee enquired as to what would be the general reaction of Parliament Security Staff with respect to Members doing video-recording or taking selfies along with others near the Building Gate, Shri Krishan Kumar submitted:—

“Sir there are no rules regulating the video-recording done by a Member and we cannot challenge them in this regard. Our job is to facilitate the Members and if they are accompanied by any visitor who holds a valid pass, we allow them to enter the building. In case the visitor does not have a valid pass, we request the Member to get the pass of the said person made from the reception office... Further, when any visitor comes to Parliament House with his mobile, his mobile is deposited at the reception gate. Now a days mobiles are equipped

with cameras and it is not possible to understand what a person is doing with his mobile. I viewed the clipping relating to entry of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP on 21 July, 2016 and I noticed that when he was entering the Parliament House, through the stairs, his mobile was facing down and it only captured the stairs and not what was in his front.”

77. On being enquired as to what are the specific duties of parliamentary security personnel with regard to security of the Parliament House Estate, Shri Rajnish Kumar Rana submitted:—

“Sir our first job is access control. Every person who enters the Parliament House should have a valid pass and he is frisked and our second task is to facilitate the Member to ensure that their entry and movements in the Parliament House Estate are without any obstruction. Thirdly, we coordinate with all the security establishments in the Parliament House Estate that is CRPF and the allied agencies and work as a team.”

78. When the Committee sought to know as to how their Parliamentary security personnel would deal with an eventuality where a Member enters to Parliament House, with a weapon, Shri Krishan Kumar submitted:—

“Sir We have no instructions or guidelines how to deal with such Members. We cannot challenge the Members in this regard. Further, there is no frisking of the MPs. However, we will inform our Senior Officers about any such situation in relation to the entry of a Member with arms and then it is upon them to take a view in the matter.”

Evidence of Shri C. Babu Rao, Deputy Secretary, PNO, Lok Sabha Secretariat

79. During his evidence before the Committee on 23 August, 2016 Shri C. Babu Rao, Deputy Secretary, Parliamentary Notice Office, Lok Sabha Secretariat *inter alia* stated as follows:—

“.....Like any other day, we were busy in receiving notices and stamping them. Meanwhile, I found that the Member was trying to take photo after stamping the notice. Then I requested the hon. Member, 'Sir, you are not supposed to take the photograph' Then he said okay. Then, I immediately turned back and started our own work for balloting. This is what has happened. During that time, about 70 to 80 PAs to the hon. Members were present and it was very crowded. It was so difficult to see who is what and all. So, we had to very seriously concentrate on the ballot which we are supposed to do. Even Maan Sir, has also come five or six minutes before nine o'clock on the 21 July, 2016. I only told him not to take photograph. He lifted his hands like this. I immediately noticed and told that you are not supposed to take photograph of the notice after stamping. Then he said okay. Thereafter, I immediately involved myself in my own work. This is what has happened on that day. Only after 3 or 4 pm in the evening, we came to know that such things have happened. Till then, we were not aware of this thing.”

80. When the Committee enquired as to whether such incident had happened for the first time and what according to him should be the manner of dealing with it, Shri C. Babu Rao replied:—

“It was the first time I happened to notice.... It is up to the higher authorities. From security point of view, there are people who are experts in this field so it is up to them to take a view.”

81. On being asked as to whether he discussed this incident and its fall out with his colleagues, Shri C. Babu Rao submitted:—

“Sir this was the first time. I had discussed it with other colleagues in the Notice Office. They also said that it was the first of its kind that has happened.”

82. When the Committee sought to know about the manner in which Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP had conducted himself in the Parliamentary Notice Office on the said date and the steps taken to deter him from doing it, Shri C. Babu Rao stated:—

“The Member lifted his hands with the camera. I thought he was taking photos. Then I immediately reached towards him and requested the Hon'ble Member that he is not supposed to take the photographs after stamping of the notice. Then he said OK, then I immediately turned back.”

83. When the Committee inquired as to what steps had been taken subsequently and why he did not inform any of Senior Officers about this incident, Shri C. Babu Rao submitted:—

“Sir in the evening I went to the Secretary-General along with my Senior Officers and apprised as to what all had happened. Actually, I never thought that he was doing videography I thought he took photos and in this regard also asked him not to do so. Thereafter, I thought he had stopped it and I was not aware that he was continuously doing it.”

84. When the Committee enquired about the rule which prohibits MPs from taking photographs and doing videography, Shri C. Babu Rao stated that he was not aware about it specifically but the Member cannot take photographs.

85. The Committee sought to ascertain the views of the officer in writing about installation of CCTV cameras in the Parliamentary Notice Office. In response, Shri C. Babu Rao *vide* his note dated 24 August, 2016 submitted as under:—

“Since PNO functions as a nodal office for receiving various kinds of notices, personally speaking, there could not be any objection as such for installation of CCTV in PNO. The work in PNO is done in a transparent manner with the objective of giving optimum service to Hon'ble Members and even their representatives. As regards the policy decision as to whether a CCTV be installed in PNO, it is humbly submitted that a considered view in this regard may have to be taken by appropriate authority at appropriate level.”

Evidence of Shri Yogesh Deshmukh, Joint Secretary (Security)

86. Elaborating on the extant security arrangements in the Parliament House Estate, Shri Yogesh Deshmukh, Joint Secretary (Security) Lok Sabha Secretariat, during his evidence before the Committee on 26 July, 2016, *inter alia* stated as follows:—

“The security system in Parliament consists of Parliament Security Service (PSS) comprising staff from both Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha Secretariat. We have Delhi Police to assist us; we have Parliamentary Duty Group (PDG) which is CRPF, armed security in Parliament. After 2001 attack, security system was taken over by the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Security (JPC). Whole security set up was looked into; the Committee visited various countries and advised on the gadgets which have to be installed; gates which are to be opened; the manpower required and over the period of time, they continue to review the security scenario as far as Parliament is concerned. For that purpose, we have divided various gates into Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha as per the directions of the JPC. Gate No. 1 which is called IG Gate No.-1, which is used by MPs and high dignitaries is with the Rajya Sabha; BG1 where MPs enter Parliament House is manned by Lok Sabha.

As regards the do's and don'ts for the security personnel of Parliament, we have standing instructions which are in Blue Book. A general guidance is from the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Security which keeps reviewing the process and security in Parliament and keeps guiding us over a period of time.

Main role of Parliament Security Service is the access control, all men and material entering this premise are first of all authorized, they have passes; once they come in, they are properly frisked; then, they are allowed and wherever they are allowed, they are allowed to roam around.

As regards videography, instructions are very specifically issued by the PPR Branch of Lok Sabha which says if videography is to be allowed, it will be allowed only to certain organizations or Government approved organizations only after due permission is given' and they take, no objection as well.

Mobile phones in general were not allowed till 2003 but in 2005, JPC decided to allow mobile phones to certain categories of people who come to Parliament premises, and accordingly mobile phones have been in use.

In this very case, on 21 July, 2016, around 8.53 to 8.54 in the morning, Shri Bhagwant Mann, Member of Parliament videographed a part of security set up and uploaded on the Facebook. That evening, it came to my notice that such a video has been made and uploaded on the Facebook. Since I was on leave on that day, my Director was in charge on that day. He called me up and told me about the incident. I urged him to rush to the Hon'ble Speaker's residence. That was after 7 p.m. same day in the evening. Around 7 p.m. the

moment I got a call from the Hon'ble Speaker's office that something like this has happened, you come. Since, I was not well and affected by viral fever, and was on leave, I could not go there; and my Director went there. After he came back, he reviewed the position, the main Iron Gate No. 1; he talked to the security personnel there; came back and made a report. He submitted it to the Secretary General, If any such incident happens and when a Member of Parliament is involved in it, then we immediately bring it to the notice of the Secretary General who, in turn, is expected to bring it to the notice of the Hon'ble Speaker and as per the directions we get, we act accordingly.

For a moment, if it is presumed that if a civilian has done such a thing and we would have come to know about it, we would have immediately caught hold of that person, interrogated him, called the Delhi Police, Intelligence Bureau, would have had a joint interrogation and handed him over to them. In this particular case, the Member of Parliament is seen videographing certain vital installations of Parliament. Accordingly, it was brought to the notice of the Secretary General. On the 22 July, 2016, when I came to the office in the morning, I ordered an inquiry.”

87. The Committee enquired as to whether Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP was kept under any observation and whether the details of the incident on 21 July, 2016 or any other day has been gone through and whether the data matches etc. In response, Shri Deshmukh submitted:—

“I have got all the records checked, whatever records which we could go for. He has attended Parliament during the last one month on 19, 20, 21 and 22 July, 2016. From the CCTV footage, *prima facie* it does not appear to be any suspicious activity as far as his movement is concerned here in Parliament in the last one month's record.

From the Facebook, people who accessed it have told me that he was streaming it live. The reason is, the time on the CCTV footage that we have recorded and the time at which it was uploaded on the Facebook, both are matching. *Prima facie* he himself was doing it. We have asked for detailed report from Intelligence Bureau (TB) in this regard.”

88. On being asked as to what the CCTV footage in the custody of Parliament Security Service is exactly showing: whether there was someone holding the recording instrument in front of Shri Mann or he was doing it himself. In response, Shri Deshmukh stated:—

“Though I have requested IB for forensics.. .but *prima facie* it appears, he is doing it himself...what we are seeing in this CCTV footage is that a vehicle is approaching at the first barrier that we have there he is being greeted. At second barrier also he is being identified and being greeted. He keeps coming ahead and gets down from his car which all is being caught and then he is entering with his phone and going inside the Parliamentary Notice Office where we do not have a camera.”

(CCTV footage furnished by the Joint Secretary (Security) was seen by the Committee)

89. When the Committee enquired about the exact seating position of Shri Mann in the car, Shri Deshmukh stated that as informed by our security officials, Shri Mann is on the front seat.

90. When asked as to what is his observation about the security threat perceptions to the Parliament House, Shri Deshmukh stated:—

“We have been regularly receiving inputs from IB that Parliament is one of the targets for terrorists.. .and with a heightened scenario, all over the world, we definitely are very worried. As an Institution, we are trying to put all we can. We are desperate for our upgradation of internal security systems, internal integrated security systems which needs upgradation badly. Since last 10 to 12 years, some of them fail sometimes. In this particular case, if such kind of video goes online and somebody happens to save it, it can be misused by any terror organisation for giving result to their nefarious designs. I am of the knowledge, to my limited knowledge, even Mr. Headly had videographed certain areas in Mumbai and which ultimately resulted in couple of blasts in Mumbai, video was something like that. I am not sure but that is the knowledge, I have. So, these kind of videos even in 2001, when attack had happened it was BG-12 and BG-1. It is just they happened to get confused. Accidently, they could not enter the House and the gates were closed. That is the area of attack. That is the maximum damage that they can do for our Members of Parliament. So, this approach of his live commentary, this is security chips we use, this is the Radio Frequency ID (RFID) cards we are issued, this is how the gates get opened, these are the people from the security who are there and who are manning it and these are the bollards, these are boom barriers and this is the approach, these are the tyre killers. For anybody planning it, it is a ready material. Okay, if I am planning, can read it. Okay, this much time I will take. Suppose, I have to go through proper permission, this much time I will take. If I bang it, this is my reaction time and how far is it from the main gate to my Parliament House main building gates. I have to use drone, I can plan that this is the area I have to approach. These are the gadgets which I have to overcome. This is the height of the bollards. The vehicle I will use, its impact it can take, I will use the vehicle which has a larger impact, to break down the physical barriers. Of course, he is showing us that how smooth if somehow somebody manages to get this Radio Frequency ID card by stealing or by copying it, by chip, somehow, though we announce the vehicle number also and we can make a fake vehicle number, you can make a fake chip, you can have an easy access inside the Parliament if the people are not alert enough. They do check with the Member of Parliament is sitting or not. Are they accompanying anybody who is not authorised? They do check. They do stop people but for somebody, who is planning an attack on this premises, it is a ready material. This is the time lag he needs. Suppose, he goes through fake pass or if he just wants to ambush it.”

91. The Committee desired to know about the possible scenarios that would have been contemplated in the instant case particularly from security angle since Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP is an authorized entrant and also a person who enjoys certain facilities by virtue of being a Member of the House. In response, Shri Deshmukh replied as under:—

“There are certain things which we wanted to bring to your notice. As an Institution, we will not let this happen. That is our priority. We may be negligent here and there once in a while and we do take action on that. We sometimes lose our alertness. That is again for us to see whether our employees are alert enough or not. Now, around more than 5,000 cameras are in place. If we have to secure our premises, this is a hazard which we have to counter. Banning all the mobile phones may not be a very good idea. All our employees, all our Members of Parliament and senior officers bring them. Everybody brings it. In any case, you can easily access these days through Google. So, that really does not make sense. Allowing cameras, which do not have videophones, is a call we have to take again. That is not practical in today's time. So, that leaves us with more than around 5,000 cameras which can be misused. One is, we have Bulletins for our Members of Parliament. So, the day this incident happened, the very next day when I had come, I drafted a Bulletin for all the Members of Parliament to be approved by the Secretary-General, regarding videography *per se* strictly, very categorically saying that this may not be done. That was one which I am putting it to the Committee. Now, today this is a security threat which can again happen. Our people are extremely stressed out with the kind of job they are doing with the limited manpower we have in our Parliament Security Service. On the gate, they are expected to, in that very short time, identify the people inside, identify the vehicle, hear the voice of the machine whether it is the same vehicle with the same number, identify the driver and the Member of Parliament and see the pass on the vehicle. When we have to monitor around 5,000 poles inside the Parliament Estate, then we definitely need an extra added manpower, extra eyes for that.”

92. When asked whether there is any automatic system of reading the number plate of the vehicle alongside the RFID on it; as also the mechanism to prevent misuse of RFID, Shri Deshmukh submitted as under:—

“As of now, the system reads the RFID and not the number plate of the vehicle. We have requested MHA this time that our videos should automatically read and alert us.”

93. To a specific query about the possible options in case of tampering of RFID and misusing it on a different car after fabricating a number plate and entering the Parliament House Estate premises, Shri Deshmukh replied as under:—

“For last couple of months we have talked to certain companies and got demonstrations so that nobody is able to tear off the RFID from the vehicle. If somebody plans to take out the RFID from a car, it does not come out and

is completely destroyed by itself As regards the number of a vehicle is concerned, we want a video analytics to automatically alert us if that number is not matching with the pass that we have given.”

94. The Committee specifically asked Shri Deshmukh as to whether he had alerted his staff to stop videographing of security installations in general. In response, he replied as under:—

“Sir, as a system, they are aware, even before I joined. Unfortunately, this videography thing has not been discussed even in JPC ever before as much as I have found out. But everybody is aware.”

95. When the Committee desired to know as to when the internal inquiry in the matter was ordered at his end, Shri Deshmukh replied as under:—

“Sir, the First Report was given on the same day when the incident had taken place, I joined the following day and the orders were issued (for detailed inquiry).”

96. When the Committee specifically asked as to what was his opinion on this particular incident, Shri Deshmukh submitted as under:—

“As a security personnel, I would say that this incident is either purely out of innocence or because of extreme negligence or is with a design. As a security personnel, I would not rest till the time I look into all the three; aspects of it including whether it is a design or not.”

97. Enquired about any remedial steps that are being planned to contain the damage in the light of the instant case, Shri Yogesh Deshmukh replied:—

“We have a Blue Book (on security instructions) and in the last couple of months, we have formed a Committee to amend it. We are looking into the shortcomings, which we have, like the videography part, and which we are going to put here. Our Inquiry Committee is also looking into the aspect as to why the videography done by the Member was not noted, if at all, they (security staff) realised that he was videographing it. If they did, why did they not inform the seniors.. .They were not expecting it from a Member of Parliament. This is a lacunae...This incident will help us in filling the gap.. We have to sit with experts from NTRO, NIA, IB, MHA & others.”

98. The Committee asked Shri Yogesh Deshmukh to furnish the CCTV footage available with Parliament Security Service, pertaining to the entry of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP into Parliament House on 21 July, 2016, to which he agreed to comply.

99. Elaborating the measures that should be taken to strengthen the security system in the Parliament House Estate, Shri Yogesh Deshmukh, Joint Secretary (Security) during his further interaction with the Committee on 23 August, 2016 *inter alia* stated, as follows:—

“In this regard I have discussed the matter with my officers. As far as the larger issue of security is concerned there are many points the basic being

the upgradation of the present security system, which is under process. We have found several lacunae in light of this particular incident. There are several things which we have not codified. Our officers do not have clear instructions on this matter. There are no specific instructions about videography in the blue book which contains mostly the standing orders which regulate our working. There is a Committee which is reviewing the instructions and will recommend as to what are the updations required in the Blue Book. On the day this incident happened, we have proposed that a Bulletin be issued to avoid any confusion about instructions relating to strict prohibition of videography. Even the officers of the Parliamentary Security Service are not very clear as to how to react and deal with such situations involving a Member of Parliament. There are no clear view points on this.

We have discussed the matter among ourselves and two - three options have been suggested.

It is understood that the option to ban mobile phones is not practical but, at the same time, we have to think over how to minimize the traffic of people inside and the least number of gadgets and other things they can bring with them in the Parliament Estate so that our premises are not threatened.

We all were of the opinion that if we reduce the number of vehicles entering the Parliament House, it will lessen the threat of possible attacks, if at all. It is a question which is still under consideration and even the Committee can look into it. As an option can we formulate a system where in least no. of vehicles enter the Parliament House Estate. One option could be, as we discussed, why cannot we have a ferry system? We can have a ferry system wherein the vehicles remain parked outside the Parliament House Estate and whosoever enters the Estate can use a ferry bus or a ferry vehicle. That was one which, we thought, might help us in reducing the number of vehicles, which will in turn help us in being more effective. It will help in reducing the checking of vehicles which enter the Parliament House Estate at times speedily. The second option is that all vehicles should be compulsorily checked. The Committee may look into it as to how much it would be feasible. The Joint Parliamentary Committee has suggested that this is not very good. Different Members of that Committee had different opinions. They never came to the conclusion. Some Members objected to the idea of their and their vehicles' frisking. Some Members suggested that it should be done and some other said that it should not be. Our security gadgets are under upgradation we are thinking about full body vehicle scanners machines which was also earlier discussed in the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Security. However, there was a practical problem that for each vehicle to pass over the vehicle scanner would require atleast 4-5 minutes and during this short period other vehicles of Hon'ble Members of Parliament may also queue up and therefore it would be difficult and practically impossible to route all the vehicles through the

vehicles scanner machine during their entry in the Parliament House Estate. It would not work out.

Therefore, the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Security could not take a decision on it. We feel and have discussed it among ourselves, the officers and staff are required to be trained at various fronts. This particular incident is unique to deal with which, we were not mentally alert.

Sir, in this regard I would also like to submit that on entry in the Parliament House Estate there are targets which are very near they may be MPs other dignitaries or the officer and staff. So, one outer layer is being manned manually, but electronic gadgets are nowhere available outside this premise. We have CCTV cameras all around us but as you mentioned that is the first stage of our checking. We also feel that you are absolutely right about this outer layer, this being the most important establishment in the whole of our country. Another security layer needs to be put in place outside the Estate. In this regard we need to have meetings with Delhi Police. The traffic on road next to Rail Bhavan, that is Raisina Road also needs to be regulated and in what manner is to be seen. After the year 2001, we closed a lot of gates. However, the number of vehicles entering Parliament House now is quite different from 2001. Number of vehicles entering the Parliament House was different than what we have today. So, we have new kind of problems. In fact, we are working out a new plan also. Which gates are to reopen and how many vehicles should enter the Estate from gate number 1, needs to be looked into. How to segregate the route of other vehicles is also being thought about. Our cameras which are currently under upgradation will be high analytical cameras and when the high security number plates are there on all the vehicles our cameras can read them and they can alert us in case of a mismatch. We are working on this mechanism.

Another thought was to make all the gates automatic so that they open and close on their own. Its advantage is that it will greatly reduce forced intrusion but then the price is an issue. It is the price that you have to pay, that is, whether it is practical or not, we will put it up in front of the Committee again. The number of visitors in Parliament Estate whether they are guests of MPs or of the staff, we feel needs to be restricted. Rules are in place, but somehow none of us are able to implement it. The number of visitors of a particular hon. MP or any of our employees is very limited, but is not being followed for whatever reasons and we also allow. When a request come from an MP, we allow it. As a result we have large number of people who are entering the Parliament House Estate, which becomes too much for us. We can keep watch till some level, however, if the number of visitors increase, naturally it affects our efficiency. As the crowd swells we have to attend so many other things which divert our attention. One thing is to receive application for Visitors Gallery online and issue the passes online. This will result in only issue of passes for the number of seats available. As of now if 250 seats are there, we normally issue passes for 500 or 400 persons. If this system goes

online then we can identify all the persons who are entering the premises. In general, we do not allow any pass for Visitors Gallery but there is a practical problem. If the guests of a Member are coming then mobile phones are not allowed to them but the Member concerned collects their mobiles and keeps it with him. This needs to be controlled. During last days, I have requested and then directed that no PA or PS of a Member should carry more than two mobile phones. It is not that, it is a very hard and fast rule. If there is a genuine case, I am always sitting and people come to me and wherever possible we always accommodate. So, from the whole security point of view, at the end of the day, it is our access control — access of vehicles and access of unidentified or general people. To strengthen it, our manpower, our gadgets and our training all three are very important. All three need to be augmented. As on date we have many vacancies and they are being processed. The proposal for technological upgradation is pending with the Ministry of Home Affairs. The discussion is already on.

Training is a regular process. From this particular incident we felt that we have to look many of the aspects internally so that such lapses do not recur. Broadly we have to see the whole security set up. I think that we will have to involve various agencies. The security mechanism in place is being implemented through the Ministry of Home Affairs and we have representatives from TB, NTRO, SPG, Parliament Security Service and Delhi Police. They all sit together, they hammer out their points and they work out a solution as to what is to be done.

The number of mobile phones inside are definitely a challenge. Despite this incident we request the dignitaries. Naturally, we also understand, that people from their constituency have come and they want to take photographs. At all times we go and request but without any tangible impact. So, this is a challenge that we have to work with. We never say that we will completely make it tight even for our Hon'ble Members. But, Sir, we have to again re-look at the whole setup and as we have proposed, we require more gadgets and we have to work it out.”

100. When asked about the criteria for selection of security personnel as also the responsibilities of the Parliament Security Staff during inter-session and issues relating to their fitness, Shri Yogesh Deshmukh replied:—

“I will have to find out this. As on date the selections being undertaken are from the Ex-servicemen only. In the past months only Ex-servicemen have been selected. They are already experienced. They are being interviewed for selection. As regards general selections are concerned there are separate rules for it and are undertaken by a different Branch of the Lok Sabha Secretariat. I am not aware about it in detail. During session time, we the security personnel to control many access points there. Leave of security personnel are not normally sanctioned during session period. Many gates are opened and new points are created resulting in increased deployment of

staff. During inter-session the manpower is limited. Some of the staff proceed on leave, some are sent for training. Accordingly, we close many of the gates as there is not much rush of visitors. Thus, naturally the deployment points are reduced.... Health check-up is a must for all the officers above 40 years. They must get a mandatory health check up done.”

101. When asked about the suggestions for regulating the use of mobile phones in the Parliament House Estate and steps to improve the alertness of the security staff, Shri Yogesh Deshmukh replied:—

“Sir, mental alertness is a habit; it is about man management; and it is a systemic improvement which we have to look into. The genesis of Parliamentary Security Service has been through the Watch and Ward Service and their role has been to facilitate or help the Members of Parliament in carrying out their responsibilities with ease. Their mandate mostly is to train themselves to identify the Members of Parliament just after their election. Our Parliamentary Security Service people are given training. They are shown photographs so that they can identify the new Members of Parliament. They are informed about their duties in the Chamber and the lobbies. On the other side, we have the Central Paramilitary Force. There we find more alertness *vis-à-vis* Parliamentary Security Service personnel employed. They are rotated every 2-3 hours. The officers monitor them throughout 24 hours and provision is made for their food and water. They are being taken care of and accordingly they work in that regimented kind of way. A couple of hours of duty keeps them alert, whether they are posted at the gates or on the rooftops. They do the work in a regimented manner. They have a weapon in their hands and they feel confident. They also stand behind the security points. This is something, I mean, in terms of alertness, we would like to copy, as far as the Parliamentary Security Service is concerned. The fact remains that they are in-charge of access control, while the PSS staff are the ones who give the passes, who identify the Members of Parliament or the guests and check their passes in the vehicles. Needless to say, Sir, you are absolutely right and the question is: how do we do that? It is a very big, should I say, Sir. To some extent they need to be organised on the basis of a Paramilitary Force. There are many advantages to it. When a person works according to his rank his activities are of a different nature. With increased number of duties, we have to have a relook at our manpower so that we can give them relief, apart from training. As Joint Secretary (Security) — I do not know whether my Directors will agree with me or not, or the PSS officers will agree with me or not — I feel that the Rajya Sabha Security Service people and the Lok Sabha Security Service people have to work as a Unit. Though I am the Operational In-charge for both the services, that is, Rajya Sabha Security Service and the Lok Sabha Security Service, there is a lack of internal coordination. Entry gates have been identified for being manned by Rajya Sabha and Lok Sabha security personnel. Complaints are received that they are not respectful, sometimes;

sometimes, they let their own Secretariat people to enjoy some benefits while not allowing the same to the other side.

For example, a couple of months ago, a security personnel was suspended. We have recommended action against some officials which is still pending. What happened is that overall discipline at all levels has a tremendous impact. If Joint Secretary (Security) has to be the in-charge and accountable for the security of Parliament Estate, then he or she should have full leverage and powers, financial powers and disciplinary powers to take quick decisions. It will help a lot. I cannot take any action against an employee of Rajya Sabha Secretariat despite him being absolutely indisciplined. There are limited cases but they do exist. Lack of coordination is apparently visible. Once this service is regimented, definitely and if they are well-trained in arms, if for any reason one security personnel is injured the other can fight back with his weapon, which we are not doing as of now. The security people work even during night and day and at times get stressed out. When we put them to work as a unit there will be minimum friction between them. Definitely, it will help a lot. Sometimes, Director of Rajya Sabha Secretariat is on round and he wants to give direction to Lok Sabha personnel, they do not take him seriously. There are demarcations. In an area which is manned by Rajya Sabha Security, the Lok Sabha Security personnel even if present there, he will not intervene in that area.

This Committee can recommend for Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha security services to work as a unit. It was discussed earlier in the Parliamentary Committee on Security. But Rajya Sabha Secretariat at that time was not of the same view. So, it went down. They still disagree to that. If we have more manpower, it is our responsibility to train them. They can go through all kinds of training like bomb disposal, VIP protection, intelligence collection etc. I think we have to re-look that their IQ is also not adversely affected. Sometimes, during Parliament session, duties are stretched for long hours. Sometimes, large crowd comes in a very short span of time. At the same time, Members of Parliament asks the personnel to coordinate something for them. In the meantime, there are high chances of people passing by the security personnel unnoticed. I ask them to try to be more alert. Once a security personnel said, Sir what all I should do. So, the number of eyes has to be increased. If lot of work comes at one time the possibility of a lapse definitely increases. If we have to control the crowd then we have to keep a keen watch on them and see that no objectionable thing or person is able to enter. No one, misuses the pass. Therefore, manpower needs to be increased.

Now coming to mobile phones, we all gave a good hammering to our mind. But we have not been able to come to any solution how to manage this. You are asking about the social media control. The Joint Parliamentary Committee on Security had given this task to Delhi Police. They are not able to do it. Should we have our own set-up here? Actually, coordination has to be done by the MHA and the task of social media monitoring has to be done by Delhi

Police. Please give us some time. If the Committee wants to listen to the whole group together, we can call some more agencies such as NTRO, SPG, IB, Delhi Police, security from MHA and we can come out with something. So far, it is not clear how do we control it.

Sir, you were asking about how to control the social media? The task of monitoring the social media is already with the Delhi Police. We can easily say that a person will not enter the Estate with a smart phone. That is also not workable. We do not have a solution as of now whether we can simply say that the software which facilitates videography should shut down automatically. We are not aware of any such app. I am really short of words. I thought and thought about it. But the fact remains that it is a compromise.”

102. When enquired about the possible steps that could be taken for better coordination and cohesion between the Rajya Sabha and Lok Sabha security personnel, and whether the number of entry gates should be increased, Shri Yogesh Deshmukh replied:—

“I am the common point for them but disciplinary and administrative control is separate. As regards co-ordination, it happens at different levels. We keep talking. All three of us, PDG, Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha, we keep sitting together. There is no problem. There is no problem on one-to-one interaction but only at times at some gates if somebody intervenes. I think, we need to have more tea or dinner together including at the lowest level and bring them together. Till the time we are combined as one service, we need to be more chatting together, working together; and a co-ordination committee as such I do not think will be required..... We will have to look into it. We would not want to open many gates for security reasons. We would like to keep the open gates as minimum as possible..... Sir if the Committee feels, the division of Gates should be done away with. All the gates should be operated jointly by both in rotation. This is my personal view.”

Evidence of Shri Alok Kumar Verma, Commissioner of Police, Delhi

103. During his Evidence before the Committee on 26 July, 2016, Shri Alok Kumar Verma, Commissioner of Police, Delhi, *inter alia* stated as follows:—

“I would like to bring certain things to the notice of the Committee. The overall area security of the Parliament House is in the domain of Delhi Police. The security around the Parliament House Estate is handled by New Delhi District which is a part of Delhi Police. In case of contingency, overall coordination is done by Delhi Police. Our arrangements around the Parliament House Estate are the first line of defence against any attack that may take place. Traffic arrangements inside as well as outside the Estate is again in the domain of Delhi Police. Staff from Delhi Police are deployed for searching, frisking and operating security equipments within the Parliament House Estate.

We have static pickets; we have *morchas*, motor patrolling, roof-top arrangements and vehicle checking teams in parking lots.

As regards the incident regarding the videography and uploading on Facebook by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP, I have not seen the original. For any legal or other aspect, the original would be required. But, as far as the videography itself is concerned, there is some area outside the Parliament House from where he started the video and he has referred to certain equipments that are there in the car, security equipments. I would like to bring to the notice of the Hon. Committee that photography outside the Parliament House is not prohibited. We have large number of foreigners who visit Rashtrapati Bhawan, North-South Blocks, North-South fountains and they take photographs. This is a historical place and they take photographs of places outside the Parliament House. As such, the security implications of taking photographs outside the Parliament House is responsibility of Delhi Police, because a large number of tourists do come and they take those photographs.

Inside the Parliament House, it is under the Joint Secretary (Security) of the Parliament. We have our staff who is searching and frisking but the Hon. Members are neither searched nor frisked.”

104. To a query as to what is the input about the security threat to Parliament House, Shri Alok Kumar Verma stated:—

“The Parliament House is a very highly sensitive place where we do have arrangements. We have arrangements all the year round, and we ensure that nothing untoward happens here.”

105. *When the Committee asked whether public disclosure of security pickets or disclosure of information about Radio Frequency (RE) tags in vehicles entering the Parliament House Estate constitutes a threat to national security, Shri Alok Kumar Verma answered in affirmative by saying that it is an "anti-national act".*

106. The Committee specifically enquired about the responsibility of Delhi Police for events both outside and inside the Parliament. In response, Shri Alok Kumar Verma stated:—

“Delhi Police in the instant case is looking after the overall (area) security of the Parliament House. If anything does happen, we will coordinate and we will take charge of the events that do happen. Otherwise, we are having pickets; we are having police control room vans; we are having roof top arrangements; and we make this arrangement with a view to ensure that nothing untoward happens here. This is outside the Parliament House.”

107. When the Committee inquired as to what action the Delhi Police would take if they observe anything unusual happening in the area from Vijay Chowk upto security gate of Parliament, Shri Alok Kumar Verma in his deposition stated:—

“Whenever we notice anything suspicious including persons moving in

suspicious circumstances, they are always rounded up and interrogated. At time even a joint interrogation takes place.”

108. When asked about whether the incident of videography by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP was noticed and reported by any of the personnel of Delhi Police, Shri Alok Kumar Verma answered in the negative.

109. On being asked about the suggestions to plug the loopholes in security arrangements in the Parliament House Estate, Shri Alok Kumar Verma stated that they had already conducted a security review around the Parliament House Estate and a proposal in this regard has been submitted to Ministry of Home Affairs.

110. To a specific query as to whether the videography done by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP outside the Parliament is legal or illegal and whether Delhi Police monitors the content on social media, Shri Alok Kumar Verma stated:—

“Taking of photographs on North Block or before the Rashtrapati Bhawan etc. is not illegal. The issue here is that the photographs that were being taken were of certain security gadgetry which involved a security system that is in place for ensuring the security of the Hon. MPs and the Parliament House. That is where this illegality or breach comes up because putting such kind of information on social media is exposing a system which is meant for security and it should not have been exposed.

As regards the monitoring of social media, we have in place a system which is not the most advanced of systems. We are in the process of identifying a system which will help us ensure that whatever activity that can have an impact on law and order or security is monitored. We don't have that very advanced software which is required for it. But we are still monitoring it. The human resources and intelligence are on the job.”

111. When the Committee sought to know as to whether it was a lapse on the part of Delhi Police for not stopping the video recording as also its uploading on social media, Shri Alok Kumar Verma stated :—

“No, it (videography) has not been reported to us (by Delhi Police Personnel). We came to know about this incident, as of now through the media and the newspapers. In fact, police does not control access or closing of social media. If anything has to be blocked on the social media, it is a different organisation which does it. We can at best request them to do it but it is not the police who block these things.”

112. The Committee asked Shri Alok Kumar Verma to submit a copy of the CCTV footage if any in possession of Delhi Police showing the movement of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP, to which he assured to comply at the earliest.

113. During his further interaction with the Committee on 21 September, 2016 on the measures that should be taken to strengthen the security system. Outside

the Parliament House Estate, Shri Alok Kumar Verma, Commissioner of Police, Delhi *inter alia* stated, as follows:—

“Sir, during the sessions of the House we deploy nearly 433 personnel of our service in plain clothes and during inter-session the number is 236. During inter-session we deploy one Company of uniform Police personnel around Parliament House Estate. They are deployed in pickets, control room vehicles, two motorcycles and in one quick reaction team. When the House is in session we deploy 7 Companies to strengthen the security in the area around the Parliament House Estate. We have sent a proposal to the Ministry of Home Affairs wherein it is suggested that 214 Police personnel of different Ranks are sought to be deployed in Parliament House Annexe and around 192 for areas near the Parliament House Estate. It is presently pending with the Home Ministry and we are pursuing it on priority. My colleagues have informed me that the proposal is pending for nearly one year and is under process. Further, there are some CCTV cameras around Parliament House Estate but their number is not much. When we saw the video clip of this incident we noticed a couple of things for which corrective measures are currently under way. We could not clearly see the car (of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP) while it was approaching the Parliament House Estate. Therefore, we require high quality of CCTV cameras which can clearly record the face and the number of the vehicle. We are trying to procure advanced technology in this regard. In this connection also a proposal has been sent to the Ministry of Home Affairs stating that there are presently 39 CCTV cameras in the surrounding areas of the Parliament House Estate but we require more such cameras in this regard.”

114. The Committee observed that the Delhi Police ought to have the best infrastructure of its own to strengthen the security around Parliament House Estate, in response, Shri Alok Kumar Verma, stated:—

“Sir, we are taking measures from our side. One point came relating to the social media which is under observation by our officers. As on date we have a basic software in this regard with us which needs to be upgraded to a more advanced version. We had some discussions with companies which provide softwares. There is one software which is quite expensive and therefore, our officers will take a decision after examining its utility.... In this regard, I just want to point out that in the last one month we conducted a review of vehicles that we require because the QRT vehicles in other parts of the city are also taken on rent. So, we have done an assessment of our requirement, which we are taking up with MHA and I think that we should be able to get that through soon. So, in the long run, we propose to replace the existing QRTs with different vehicles. We have finalised the criteria and thereafter we will be sending the proposal also. We will be able to send it in the next few days as it is prepared. In fact, we, in the Delhi Police had a High-Level Committee formed, where we had decided the criteria and a proposal based on that criterion is also under process. It has been sent to the State Government with

a copy to the Central Government. The LG has to recommend it. Thereafter, that also will be taken up... We have undertaken an exercise and the process is on whereby we are in the process of finalising the technology and the equipment by which we will upgrade the CCTVs outside the Parliament House... .Basically, we are looking for a technology, which can serve our needs. Some CCTVs have already been deployed or are there at present, which we feel are of a lower technology. We need higher technology. So, we are in the process of going for the same.”

115. In light of threat perception the Committee sought to understand the assesment of Delhi Police about the security infrastructre available with them *vis-a-vis* those available with agencies in foreign countries. In response, Shri Alok Kumar Verma, replied:—

“At the outset, I may mention that when I said there is no specific threat, I did not mean there is no threat. This is an iconic building; it is a symbol of our democracy and there is a threat to it for which arrangements are made around the Parliament House and also inside the Parliament House. The Delhi Police is covering the area around the Parliament House.

As far as technology is concerned, recently, we have held some demonstrations about face recognition and cameras. We have tried them out in the Metro Stations and we have in a way have said yes to that technology. The process is now on. A decision has to be taken. We will probably have to go in for open tendering. This is now at the discussion stage; technology has been tested and tried also. We are in the process of upgrading our technology.

We gear up to all such occasions including festive season and adequate precautions are taken by way of checks and counter-checks, physical arrangements on ground, and intelligence development. We go into all these aspects whenever any celebration or any function takes places in the City.

I had mentioned about the CCTV cameras not being of very high quality which could have detected the number or the face recognition, etc. Similarly, in regard to certain areas, we have already taken up the matter with the Home Ministry where we need to strengthen the arrangements around the boundary.

The security of Parliament House is of utmost importance to us; we take it so and we also review it. That is why we have submitted these proposals for augmenting wherever we feel they need to be augmented. It is a continuous process. Wherever we feel that any action is to be taken, we have taken it promptly. Of course, upgradation of technology and increase in manpower, etc., these take time. As far as we are concerned, if any action is to be taken on the part of the Delhi Police, it is being taken promptly.”

116. Enquired about the details regarding maintenance of relevant and updated data bank of persons, who in the opinion of Delhi Police pose a security threat and how such they be tracked, Shri Alok Kumar Verma, submitted:—

“Sir, we are in close coordination with all State Police Organizations and information is shared immediately. They either share it with us or, at times, we share the information with them. For the security of the Parliament House, for instance, spotters from other States are also deployed here for identifying people who can pose a threat.

Photographs are shown to our people deployed around Parliament House at regular intervals. Yes, we can ensure that it is done more frequently. As you said, effectively on ground, it should come down in their minds and they should be able to do it. We can pay some more attention and do it more frequently also.”

117. When the Committee desired to know about the assessment, of performance, efficiency and monitoring of work by the Delhi Police security personnel, Shri Alok Kumar Verma, submitted:—

“Sir, we conduct briefing meeting from time to time. We repeatedly try to emphasise as to how they have to work. It is our endeavour that they give their best performance. As I have already submitted there is a need to upgrade the equipments for which the process is already underway. We have also requested for additional man-power to beef up the security arrangements around Parliament House. I feel that repeated briefings, carrying on, on the spot supervision and checks are some efforts which will result in our staff being more alert and we do undertake these tasks regularly..... There is no doubt that monitoring can be improved. We are doing it and we will continue to do it. I request that instructions given by the Committee will be complied with. We will ensure that those directions are implemented on the ground.”

118. To a specific query regarding the issues relating to monitoring of the content of social media by the Delhi Police, as also the actual physical security arrangements around Parliament House Estate and the jurisdiction of Delhi Police in this regard, Shri Alok Kumar Verma, replied:—

“Sir, as I mentioned in the very beginning about our shortcomings of which the CCTV cameras around Parliament House Estate is a major shortcoming. The second shortcoming is the non-availability of latest software with Delhi Police for monitoring the content of social media as a result of which we are not able to monitor it in a more better way. It is our endeavour that we should improve our standards. We have discussed the shortcomings among ourselves and wherever required we have briefed our officers and will also upgrade our instruments in this regard....

Sir, there are 14 points around Parliament House Estate which we cover from security point of view. Barricades have been erected alongwith pickets and about ten personnel are deployed there. Further, ten personnel are also deployed for foot patrolling. We have deployed seven of our staff at metro stations and six for patrolling by motorcycles. Thirteen personnel are deployed

as a part of roof top arrangements and sixteen are there for PCR vans. There is also a control-room van deployed. There is also a team of NSG commandos here. Persons have been deployed to check vehicles parked in the parking lots and they see and check that no suspicious items are found there. There are commandos of Delhi Police also and ten of them are deployed around Parliament House. There is also an ambulance and 26 other staff in and around the pickets. Further, there are some personnel who are kept as reserved to intervene in law and order situations. Demonstrations which take place are stopped at the Parliament Street near Jantar Mantar. All the staff personnel are briefed and told about their duties and how they are to be performed. Senior officers themselves brief them. All the points have different duties for which the concerned staff are briefed. After this incident we have specifically briefed many of our staff members. This is a continuous process. They will be continued to be briefed in future so that they can properly perform the duties assigned to them.”

119. On being asked whether any special security arrangements are proposed to be made for monitoring of key buildings including Parliament House, Shri Alok Kumar Verma, submitted:—

“Sir, the equipments have to be modernised and we are on the job. I want to give a clarification that our proposal for man-power is one year old. That of equipments is under process and we have identified the equipments. We will probably get the latest equipment. It will be our effort to modernise ourselves so that we are able to meet new challenges. We need 192 manpower for Parliament House only. There is a different criteria for other areas in Delhi for which we have also sent a proposal. To my understanding this will be done in three phases and we may not get the requisite man-power at one go.”

Briefing by Shri Vikram Srivastava, IPS (Retd.), Former DG CRPF

120. In his briefing at the sitting of the Committee held on 10 November, 2016, Shri Vikram Srivastava, stated as under:—

“I had the occasion to see the video which was shared on the social media. This video covers right from Vijay Chowk right up to the time when the concerned Member had come inside and was waiting for his lottery by which the matters are being selected. Sir, to me, there appears no reason, no ostensible reason as to why from Vijay Chowk Police security barriers to the Parliament Gate and then crossing the boom barriers to the porch why this kind of recording should have been done. Thereafter, when he was inside the premises of the Parliament House, there also he had made the recording.

This directly implies that keeping in view what has happened earlier at the time of attack on Parliament House, all these details provide very crucial information to those who are against the system and to those who want to cause harm. They know the number of people, plain clothed or uniformed, who are present at the spot. They know the kind of barrier whether it can be rammed through and forceful entry can be made. They also know where the

security people are located on the planks, how far they can resist or stop a fast moving vehicle from gaining access because once a person is inside a place like the porch where the hon. Members get down and go, once any intruder gets access there, then everything has been breached. He should not have released it. I do not know why he released it. Maybe, he is having his own reasons. But least of all, it has hardly anything to do with education, as I heard on the video.

Now it is very difficult. We have the gadgets now. We have mobile phones with recording systems. You just have to hold and keep pointing the camera, when you are travelling in a car, it will record everything. Just a press of the button and it goes wherever it has to go. So, this is a very disturbing thing because there are instructions. I understand there is a circular. Maybe, it is for the information of those who work in this entire premise, not specifically for the hon. Members. But something would need to be done. Once we have allowed laptops and mobile phones, the Members, of course, we hope and trust that in view of the decorum of the House and the security arrangements would be given importance. The Annexe building, Library etc. and other vital installations are located here. Firstly, such a thing should not have happened. It has happened for the first time and suitable cognizance should be taken thereof.

With your permission, I have a oral suggestion to make, we have many experienced officers who deal with Delhi Police. Many of the security persons provide overt and covert security cover. They have important role. We have gadgets to tackle biological, nuclear and chemical threats. We have to take a holistic view by hearing the subject experts so that all the aspects are taken due care and remedial and corrective measures can be taken note off. Gadgets are available to tackle all sort of threats including CBRN threats and comprehensive view can be taken. It has to be put in place; it has to be implemented on the ground. Areas in entire premises have to be blocked off in an emergency. It all works as a system. It works automatically.”

121. When the Committee enquired about the availability of and what he thinks about the nature of threats which may emanate, Shri Vikram Srivastava replied:—

“The threat will emanate from outside the boundary of Parliament and will come within the premises of Parliament. Then, what kind of a situation will develop in the House and how should we react? It may involve evacuation measures; it may involve safe areas, which we can use at the time of CBRN attacks. We can tackle all situation including CBRN threats. Funds are not a constraint nor is the training. Countries like UK, Germany, Japan etc. have such equipments. We have knowledge of it. Thus, a concrete action plan can be formulated and the necessary equipments can be procured. This is my well considered opinion. There is no reason why we cannot do that.”

122. On being asked about the role of CRPF in the Parliament Security, Shri Vikram Srivastava submitted:—

“Sir, the CRPF deployed in Parliament House is classified as Parliament Duty Group and is exclusively for Parliament security. There are overt and covert deployments. There are many security processes which start six hours before the commencement of Parliament session so that no last minute hurdles are faced and all the area is sensitized including, the streets and lawns to derail any possibility of any equipment being activated from outside. They also have a dog squad for help.”

123. The Committee sought specific suggestions for further strengthening the security infrastructure of the Parliament House in view of the disclosures made by the footage, Shri Vikram Srivastava, replied:—

“Sir, I will say whatever equipment we need and whatever things need to be done, we should consider it. It is not only just a video-streaming. If this comes in the hands of terrorists, they get to know exactly what the layout is and how they need to go. They get to know that there are maximum two people at this check point, they can ram into this area and after going right, they can reach right inside. So, if all these things fall in wrong hands, then it is very sad.

Even if something happens outside the boundary of this institution, what is the reaction? Supposing there is some biological or chemical weapon used outside, with this kind of wind blowing, it will go all around. What do we do? Who will react? Delhi Police is to react. Not only Delhi Police, even the CRPF, which is here, should have something to deploy. The system inside the building should be such that we should be able to block off certain portions so that it does not spread throughout. We should have some place from where we can provide safe passage. Maybe we could have a hall or two where we can hold 200 or 300 people in an emergency which is provided with external ventilation, exclusive electricity and communication lines so that it does not interfere with the system, no matter what the hazard is. We must consider this in all entirety.”

124. When asked about his views on the use of electronic gadgets in the Parliament House Estate, Shri Vikram Srivastava submitted:—

“I will reiterate that for cyber security we have technology by which we can stop live streaming videos and we can contain such situation. It is the job of Parliament Security that things which are allowed inside Parliament for Members are not subject to any such misuse.”

We must respect the decision of the Parliament. If they have allowed something. At the same time, we must also try and ensure to the extent possible that it is not misused and has any adverse security implications. There are many experienced officers who have dealt with security and have been here for

many years and who know the job, and (can advice so) that a comprehensive good view can be taken by Hon. Committee.”

Findings, Conclusions and Observations

125. The Committee at the outset would like to put in perspective the crux of the matter under consideration before them. The matter owes its origin to the unauthorized videographing and posting of critical footage of security arrangements in Parliament House Estate on social media by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP on 21 July, 2016.

On 22 July, 2016 several Members raised the matter in the House terming it as a serious breach of security of the Parliament on the part of Shri Mann and his conduct being unbecoming of a Member. Expressing her serious concern in the matter and taking into account the sense of the House and the views of Leaders of political Parties, Speaker, Lok Sabha constituted this *Ad Hoc* Inquiry Committee, with the following remit:—

- (i) *to Inquire into the serious security implications and related aspects germane to and arising out of the conduct of audio visual recording around Parliament House Estate and in the installations situated within the Parliament House by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP on 21 July, 2016 and subsequent uploading of the said audio visual recording by him on social media;*
- (ii) *suggest suitable remedial measures to avoid recurrence of such incidents in future; and*
- (iii) *recommend appropriate action in the matter.*

126. The core issue here is security implications of making public by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP, of the security arrangements at the Parliament Iron Gate No.1 which is the primary entry point for Members and other VIP movement to Parliament House Estate. Attendant to this, is the motive or intention of Shri Mann behind posting of impugned video recording on social media, which has raised the concern of one and all in the context of security scenario in India and abroad.

127. It is against this backdrop that the Committee would proceed to deliberate upon the matter under examination within the following parameters.

Security implications arising out of the incident

128. Parliament of India is the most dominant and singular manifestation of our country's vibrant and very effective democratic polity. This revered Institution, the temple of democracy, had weathered many challenges and stood the tests of time. Day by day it is gaining in strength and stands out as a symbol of hope for Millions of people of our country.

129. Parliament House Estate which houses the Parliament of India is in itself a rarified Estate. While this attracts awe and respect by one and all, it is also a highly

sensitive area from the security point of view. So what logically follows is that it always faces grave security threat from perpetrators of unrest and anarchy.

130. The horror of the dastardly terrorist attack on Parliament of India on 13 December, 2001 still haunts us. But for the valiant and phenomenal courage and presence of mind by security men of Parliament Security Service, Para-Military personnel, and others who laid down their lives, the consequences of the attack to say the least would have been catastrophic.

131. Aftermath of this attack led to a comprehensive review of security arrangements for the Parliament resulting in complete overhaul of security apparatus, security systems and procedures to secure Parliament. These involved both covert and overt security arrangements to prevent and foil the recurrence of such attacks.

132. Under these circumstances the Committee emphatically stress that the Parliament security is of paramount importance. There needs to be constant vigil and alertness. In the context of security scenario particularly so under the present circumstances, this country can ill afford any kind of let up or slip, howsoever, seemingly insignificant it may appear.

133. The Committee would also like to place on record their considered observations in view of the gravity of the matter. The Committee consider this incident as a wake up call to all concerned about the damage which can be done by activities such as videography of the Parliament House Estate which otherwise seemingly may appear to be an act of innocence or arising out of curiosity, but in the context of today's security scenario, can lead to immense damage. The Committee feel that it is time to seek the assistance of best technological advancement in the field of monitoring and surveillance of security threats which may emanate from unsuspected quarters. The Committee are of the considered view that intense and periodic sensitisation of the agencies, which are responsible for the security of the Parliament House Estate along with redefining the security protocols and guidelines will to a great extent bolster the security apparatus. The norms of videography of the Parliament House Estate should have a statutory backing and be well published in the form of *Dos* and *Don'ts*.

The Committee in this regard would also like to draw attention to the use of electronic devices in some foreign Parliaments. A brief statement showing the position obtaining in some important Parliaments is placed as **Annexure⁴** to the Report.

134. The Committee while emphasising upon the above recommendations would like to state that review and strengthening of security mechanisms in the Parliament House Estate is an ongoing process which should be the responsibility of a specialized cell or agency. Further, the Committee on their own and on the basis of the evidence of the witnesses who appeared before it have come to a conclusion that the videography done by Shri Bhagwant Mann has compromised the security of Parliament and unknowingly provided critical information to anti-national

⁴Annexure.

elements. However, the extent of damage arising from there and what implications there might be and specific steps for further strengthening security, require detailed technical appraisal by domain experts in the field. The Committee nonetheless on the basis of evidence tendered and documents on record suggest in the succeeding paras a broad outline of steps that needs to be taken in this regard.

Remedial Measures and suggestions on security aspects

135. The measures, which the Committee consider as necessary to improve the security scenario in the Parliament House Estate and to arrest any loopholes in the security arrangements in the premises are broadly suggested in the following para.

136. A complete review of the present security arrangements in consultation with Parliament Security Service and other security experts (as considered necessary) starting from Iron Gate 1 PH to all entrances and exits to Parliament House Estate needs to be undertaken. A Report based on this study may be presented with observations from Security point of view to the JPC on Security. The Committee feel that there is a need for urgent relook in regard to augmentation and upgradation of various security features in tune with the technological advancements and particularly with regard to the following matters to which the Committee came across during the course of the examination of the subject.

- (i) The existing security gadgets / installations located in Parliament House Estate need to be assessed for their performance and relevance in keeping with the threat perception and advancement of technology.
- (ii) Since the Parliament House is a historic and heritage building there remains a desire among the visitors, staff and the guests to take a snap as a mark of memory. This aspect has to be balanced along with a strict policy of non-compromising with the security aspects. This requires laying of norms for duly authorized videography of 'safe areas', which may be classified after a thorough assessment by the security agencies and they being convinced that videography of such areas would not result in any damage or threat to the security apparatus of the Parliament House Estate.
- (iii) In the emerging technological scenario, the Committee feel that banning of mobile / smart phones in the Parliament House Estate is neither practical nor feasible and will result in inconvenience to all concerned. The Committee however, feel that the use of mobile phones and other e-gadgets need to be regulated. The use of such gadgets in areas/ zones wherein permissible or strictly off limits, may be ear-marked to reduce the risk of anyone deliberately or unintentionally causing breach of security of Parliament House or the unauthorized recording of proceedings of the House or its Committees.
- (iv) The Committee are also of the view that security threats to the Parliament House in general should not act as a deterrent for ordinary visitors.

The ethos of Democracy, as summed up in the words of Abraham Lincoln, is 'government of the people, by the people, for the people'. The Government or the political executive emanates from the Parliamentarians. The Parliamentarians being public representatives cannot be cut-off from the public. However, to strike a balance the entry of ordinary visitors may be regulated in a manner so as not to put any unnecessary pressure on the staff manning the security of the Estate.

The Committee would also like to observe that visitors of the Members should not accompany them beyond a certain point as it results in some practical problems. While the Members get busy in the discharge of their parliamentary duties the visitors have no option but to roam or hang around the various unrestricted places like corridors etc., in the Parliament House or around the canteens with no meaningful purpose. The Members should also discourage their personal staff from carrying the mobile phone or other e-gadgets of their guests which otherwise they are not allowed to carry in the Estate as per the extant instructions.

- (v) Another issue which the Committee feel as vital from the security angle is the entry of vehicles in Parliament House Estate. Though as per the extant instruction, no vehicle can enter the Parliament House Estate without a pass but there is no system to check the articles/materials contained in any vehicle which otherwise is authorized to enter. Parking of such vehicles outside the Parliament House Estate and entry of Members through duly authorized ferry vehicles also does not seem practical as this may cause undue inconvenience to the Members. However, the Members should be prepared to wait at the entry gates till the security officers after being satisfied allow their vehicles to enter the Parliament House Estate.

The Committee also recommend that Members and their drivers and the drivers of other vehicles entering Parliament House should strictly ensure that no unauthorized items are brought to the Parliament House in their vehicles.

- (vi) The Committee do not wish to recommend any changes in the extant guidelines of checking and frisking of goods and persons entering the Parliament House Estate as it may not only cause inconvenience to Members but also affect the work of Parliament / Parliamentary Committees.
- (vii) The Committee would further like to dwell upon the aspects of security of Parliament House Estate which can broadly be divided into three spheres namely manual or physical security, technological security and cyber security. The overall aim of such security arrangements is to deter the potential attackers and to make them realize the futility of their unholy task.

Physical security comprises of aspects to secure the Parliament House Estate and its periphery to deter potential intruders, detect any intrusion and to respond within least possible time after detection of any such intrusion. The Parliament House Estate already has physical barriers, such as wall, fences and vehicle barriers and other gadgets installed to control unauthorized access within the Estate. Access control and identification system are in place, which are manned by the PSS staff. However, there are no actual and effective buffer zones to the various entry points to the Estate.

- (viii) In this regard the basic need which the Committee feel is to create a security barrier resulting in buffer zone around the Parliament Estate, wherein visitors and vehicles with passes only are allowed and their passes are manually checked. This may result in slight delay and inconvenience but can be managed with technological help of gadgets such as hand held chip readers. The second stage of manual security is the stage of actual entry in the Parliament Estate, wherein both manual and technological checks are done. The Committee feel that technological up gradation in this regard must be expedited at the earliest *inter alia* by installation of car scanners, face recognition software, wherein alarm and sensors should automatically trigger off in case of any mismatch with the available data and details uploaded in the gadget / software.
- (ix) The role of CCTVs for effective monitoring of the movements of persons and vehicles is well recognized in security systems of important buildings and installations. The present incident has highlighted the limitations of the CCTVs under the jurisdiction of Delhi Police and those under the control of Parliament Security Service (PSS) in terms of quality of picture and resolution. The resolution of the images are of poor quality as witnessed by the Committee in the CCTV footage provided by Delhi Police and even the CCTV footage of PSS are of not high quality. The Committee would strongly recommend for technological upgradation of the CCTV cameras installed by the Delhi Police and the Parliament Security Service expeditiously so as to capture high resolution images of the movements outside and within the Parliament House Estate and enhance the effectiveness of remote monitoring by the concerned security staff.

137. The Committee hope that steps proposed to be taken by Delhi Police with regard to manpower and material for further augmenting the security arrangements in and around Parliament House Estate as per the mandate would be expedited with the cooperation of the Ministry of Home Affairs in the best interest of security. The Committee also hope that Delhi Police will be more pro-active in cyber monitoring of threats to the citizens in general and the Parliament specifically by procuring requisite software and deploying the required manpower to monitor it.

General Suggestions

138. Other than Rule 349 (xxii) of Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha which *inter alia* provides that while the House is sitting, a Member shall not bring or play cassette or tape recorder in the House; there are no laid down provisions either in the Rules of Procedure or Directions by the Speaker with regard to photography and videography of precincts of Parliament House. Further, there are only internal guidelines in regard to photography and videographing in Parliament House Estate, issued by Press and Public Relations Wing of Lok Sabha Secretariat. However, these have no backing of the Rules as such nor there is a general awareness in this regard.

139. Some of the Branches of the Lok Sabha Secretariat and similarly of the Rajya Sabha Secretariat have a direct interface with Members with regard to receipt and processing of their notices etc. The feasibility of bring these Branches under CCTV coverage so as to make their working transparent may be examined and a considered view be taken.

Broadly the Committee in the above context would suggest that the CCTVs may be installed at the following points/places:—

- (i) At Gate No. 1, Parliament House, leading upto Parliamentary Notice Office (PNO).
- (ii) Parliamentary Notice Office (PNO), Room no. -21.
- (iii) Members Services Branch.
- (iv) Members Salaries and Allowances Branch.

140. Presently, Rule 374A of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha provides for automatic suspension of Members. The feasibility of incorporation of a new Rule 374B providing penal provisions in regard to violations of provisions of Rules 349 and 352, could be explored.

141. After due consideration a mechanism needs to be put in place to ensure that any video footage of Parliament, Parliament House Estate or installations thereof, can be aired or brought in public domain only after clearance by the competent authority.

The Conduct of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP

142. Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP in his depositions had tendered unconditional apologies for his indiscretion. He took pains to explain that it was never ever his intention to compromise the Parliament Security in any manner. He expressed his complete ignorance about guidelines on prohibition on video recording of Parliament premises / installations and thereafter posting it on social media and further submitted that he has not seen any signboard in Parliament House Estate about it. He also stated that there is also a lack of awareness about these guidelines among the Members/visitors and staff of Lok Sabha Secretariat/Rajya Sabha Secretariat and those of the allied agencies.

143. The Committee would find it very pertinent to observe here that all these years none of the members and all others who had access to Parliament House Estate ever even thought of video recording of the security arrangements in place in Parliament House Estate and its installations.

144. The Committee finds it tragic - comical the assertion of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP that he wanted to educate his constituents. The Committee feel that the conduct of Shri Mann and the manner in which he deposed before the Committee reveals that he is totally ignorant of the Parliamentary Rules, procedures and conventions and its applicability in discharge of his duties as a legislator will need to be understood by him in letter and spirit. The Committee feel he needs to fully familiarize and educate himself and therefore are not convinced by the reasoning given by him to live stream his movements both outside and inside the Parliamentary premises, in the public domain as being educational. The Committee feel that the impugned act of the member in the instant case would unwittingly lead to educating the persons with nefarious designs against the country.

145. The act of videography of the entry route etc., with explanatory commentary done by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP and made public by its posting on a social media not only exposed the vital security arrangements of the Parliament House Estate but also made public his notice of Zero Hour and the ballot process of selecting notices given by Members for raising of matters of urgent public importance in Zero Hour. Such an act amounts to publication of the procedures of the House which is regulated by Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. All papers connected with the Lok Sabha and the Secretariat thereof are printed and published under the authority of the House. In this regard, attention is drawn to the provisions of Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, which states as under:—

"(1) The Speaker may authorise printing, publication, distribution or sale of any paper, document or report in connection with the business of the House or any paper, document or report laid on the table or presented to the House or a Committee thereof

(2) A paper, document or report printed, published, distributed or sold in pursuance of sub-rule (1) shall be deemed to have been printed, published, distributed or sold under the authority of the House within the meaning of clause (2) article 105 of the Constitution.

(3) If a question arises whether a paper, document or report is in connection with the business of the House or not, the question shall be referred to the Speaker whose decision shall be final."

It is thus clear from the above rule that a Member is not authorized to publish or distribute any paper or document connected with the business of the House unless authorised so by the Speaker. Shri Mann by the act of videographing directly publicised the process of dealing with the Zero Hour notices to be raised by the

Members in the House and also publicised his notice of Zero Hour without any authority of Speaker, Lok Sabha and thereby violated the provisions of the Rules.

146. Rule 334A of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business which prohibits advance publicity of any notice, states as under :—

"A notice shall not be given publicity by any member or other person until it has been admitted by the Speaker and circulated to Member.

Provided that a notice of a question shall not be given any publicity until the day on which the question is answered in the House."

Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP by posting the video on the facebook (which includes his zero hour notice) has also violated Rule 334A of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business, which prohibits Members from giving advanced publicity to their notices.

147. To regulate the procedure of videography in Parliament House Estate, guidelines have been laid down by the Press and Public Relations Wing of the Lok Sabha Secretariat. These are as under:—

- (i) Requests only from Government Organizations and Government sponsored private agencies may be entertained.
- (ii) The film/photograph should be purely for educational purposes and not for commercial purposes.
- (iii) No individual should appear in the shots.
- (iv) Film shots/photographs of Parliament House should synchronize with the script of the film/programme.
- (v) Permission to be granted only on holidays and during inter-session periods.
- (vi) Security clearance of the crew (not accredited to PIB) by the Parliament Security.
- (vii) Permission only for select places for which requests has been made.
- (viii) The photographs to be taken under the supervision of a security officer.
- (ix) A copy of the CD will be supplied to the Secretariat on complimentary basis (if the film pertains to parliamentary matters).

In the light of the guidelines enumerated above, in the fitness of things, prior permission ought to be taken for filming or photoshoot of the Parliament House Estate (even if it is for educational purpose) by all persons or agencies desirous of doing so.

Shri Bhagwant Mann has therefore, also acted in violation of the above procedure, by videographing the entry points and the related security arrangements in the Parliament House premises.

148. Further the Committee also find that in the video recording of Parliamentary Notice Office, Shri Mann *inter alia* commented that out of 160 notices of the Zero Hour, only 20 will be selected by the ballot. Consequently, remaining 140 Members lost their chance. The Committee would here like to emphasize that balloting of notices given by Members, under various rules for determining their *inter se* priority has been a long and well-settled practice even having mandate under Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business. Hence, the observation by Shri Bhagwant Mann, also unwittingly tantamounts to commenting and questioning the Parliamentary procedure and further indirectly blames the House for devising a mechanism which debars a majority of the Members from raising their issues before it. The Committee find it pertinent to emphasise here that nothing could have been more far from the truth. The instant ballot which the Member live streamed was of Zero Hour notices. Zero Hour in itself is a Parliamentary device which does not find a mention in the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha and has been developed through a convention, whereby Members have been provided with an opportunity to raise matters of *urgent* public importance in the House at the earliest available opportunity. Here the word urgent is of immense importance *i.e.*, matters which are of emergent nature and need to be brought before the House without any delay. The Committee would not like to comment on the issues which are raised by Members under this device by their interpretation of the term urgent but the procedure in its letter and spirit is to provide opportunity for raising matters of urgent public importance only. Further, the restrictions of twenty Members getting *a chance in the ballot is correct but in practical terms the Speaker or the Chair by and large do permit other Members to raise their matters of urgent public importance, even if they have not been listed in the ballot. Therefore, the portrayal of Shri Bhagwant Mann of the manner in which the Zero Hour notices are disposed of through the process of balloting does not give a complete picture of the actual position.*

149. The Committee at this stage would also like to draw attention to the definition of 'Misconduct' which has been laid down in the second Report of the Committee to Inquire into Misconduct of Members of Lok Sabha (14th Lok Sabha). The Committee in Para 84 of their Report on 'Various facets of Misconduct and Basic Attributes of Standards of Conduct/Behaviour Expected of Members' held that "Misconduct may, however, be broadly defined as conduct unbecoming of a member of Parliament which may include acts of misuse and abuse by members of their powers, privileges and immunities or rights and facilities enjoyed by them by virtue of being a member or of their status and position as such member, either in discharge of their parliamentary duties or in discharge of their public duties".

150. *Notwithstanding Shri Mann's assertion that he had no mortified intention of compromising Parliament Security, his impugned act of video recording is a highly irresponsible act. In this context the Committee would like to draw attention to the teachings of wise men who have equated unwisely, bold or a rash act to foolhardiness as personified by the character of Don Quixote as portrayed by the great Spanish writer Miguel de Cervantes in his celebrated work "Don Quixote".*

In this connection, it is pertinent to cite the following quotation of German Writer and Statesman Johann Wolfgang von Goethe which aptly describe the conduct of Shri Mann:—

“There is nothing more frightful than ignorance in action.”

While it may not be that feasible to establish mens rea in Shri Mann's conduct, *the Committee express their strong displeasure over this act which they hold a gross misdemeanour and indiscreet behaviour. Such a conduct does not behove well for an elected representative of people and is a conduct unbecoming of a Member.*

151. The Committee would like to hold in unequivocal terms that the conduct of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP has been one of intransigence and he did not display any remorse for his behaviour. Further, the Committee are at pains to point that there was shift in the stand as well as contradictions and inconsistencies in the replies furnished to the Committee. While in his letter addressed to the Hon'ble Speaker on 22 July, 2016, he has offered unconditional apology whereas in his reply dated 28 July, 2016 furnished to the Committee, he has offered an apology with some riders. Despite giving an another opportunity to amend/revise his reply, Shri Mann chose to stick to his earlier stand refusing to make any amends to his reply. It is pertinent to mention that it was only after his third appearance before the Committee that Shri Mann could realize the inherent contradictions in the reply furnished to the Committee and the resultant flip-flop in his stand and that too upon being specifically pointed out by the Chairperson and other Members of the Committee. The Chairperson and the other Committee members drew specific attention of Shri Mann, to the fact that on one hand his stand before the Committee is denial of any security breach and on the other hand he was seeking humble and unconditional apology on the lines as submitted earlier to the Speaker. Finally he has stated that he has not committed any act which needs to be inquired into and that the inquiry proceedings should be closed. *Thereafter, reason dawned upon Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP and on introspection he finally realized his folly and requested the Committee for taking on record only his unconditional apology and to treat the rest of the portion of his written reply / statement viz. "need for inquiry/investigation into impugned actions of Prime Minister in the aftermath of terrorist attack on Pathankot Airbase", as withdrawn*⁵.

152. The Committee observe that Privileges come with responsibility. An irresponsible conduct and behaviour is not expected from a public representative holding an elected office.

153. The Committee firmly are of the opinion that the act of videography and live-streaming it on the social media by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP has resulted in breach of Parliament security and is a conduct unbecoming of a Member. Painful

⁵Appendix-IV.

as it might be, the Committee are left with no other option and but to hold so, for one of their own colleague, *inter alia* to prevent recurrence of such incidents.

Recommendations

154. In view of the observations at para 136 above, the Committee feel that a thorough review on the damage caused and the security implications thereof in detail may be considered for in-depth examination by the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Security and the Ministry of Home Affairs, Government of India, for making suitable recommendations in this regard.

155. The Committee also recommend that the feasibility of implementation of general observations made at paras 138-140 may also be considered. They also note that there are some serious issues *vis-a-vis* the Parliament Security, which need to be addressed on priority.

156. In view of the findings, conclusions and observations at paras 151 and 153, the Committee recommend that the conduct of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP is highly objectionable and exhibits of him being bereft of basic knowledge and etiquettes and the responsibilities of the office which he holds. By his improper conduct Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP has put the security of the Parliament House and its occupants at risk. Further, Shri Mann in his replies submitted to the Committee, did not take a coherent and consistent stand and it was only after grant of repeated opportunities to explain the inherent contradictions in his replies that he finally chose to correct himself. In his final deposition before the Committee on 28 November, 2016, he submitted that he is partially withdrawing his earlier letters dated 28 July and 01 August, 2016, submitted to the Committee and also tendered his unconditional apology. Subsequently, in his e-mail communications⁶ dated 06 December, 2016, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP while tendering unconditional apology and withdrawing his letters dated 28 July and 1 August, 2016, reiterated the same paras as contained in the said letters stating "I deny that I have by any act of omission or commission on my part breached the security arrangements of the Parliament". He further denied that "I have conducted videography of the Parliament House Estate and its installations, security arrangements of Parliament House precincts or have uploaded critical footage in the manner as alleged..."

The Committee feel that the same contradictions are repeatedly surfacing again and again in the communications of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP and, therefore, the tendering of his apology to the Committee cannot

⁶Appendices-V&VI.

be treated as unconditional apology, as stated.

The Committee, therefore, after due deliberations recommend that Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP may be suspended for the remaining period of the current session *i.e.* the Tenth Session of 16th Lok Sabha.

157. The Committee would like to also impress upon Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP the utmost need for strict adherence to norms and standards of etiquette, due compliance of the Rules of Procedure and well settled rich traditions of the Parliament and the need to uphold the decorum and discreetness. The Committee firmly desire that Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP, will refrain from such misdemeanour in future.

NEW DELHI;
7 December, 2016
16 Agrahayana, 1938 (*Saka*)

DR. KIRIT SOMAIYA,
Chairperson,
Committee to Inquire into
the Improper Conduct of a Member.

APPENDICES

STATEMENT OF LETTERS RECEIVED FROM SHRI BHAGWANT MANN, MP

Sl. No.	Date	Subject	Appendix No.
1	2	3	4
1.	22.07.2016	Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP <i>vide</i> his letter dated 22 July, 2016 addressed to Hon'ble Speaker, admitted that he unknowingly made a video of the Parliament House while coming to the House on 21 July, 2016. He tendered unconditional apology for his act.	I
2.	28.07.2016	Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP in his reply dated 28 July, 2016 submitted to the Committee <i>inter alia</i> stated that the actions of the Hon'ble Prime Minister (in the matter of attack on Pathankot Airbase) have compromised national security and he should be inquired into and investigated. He further stated that "I have not committed any act which would amount to a breach of Security arrangements of Parliament and request that the present inquiry be closed without any further action" .	II
3.	01.08.2016	In pursuance of an opportunity given to Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP to revise or amend his stand if so he desires, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP in his reply dated 01 August, 2016 submitted to the Committee reiterated the contents of his reply dated 28 July, 2016 word by word without any change or amendment.	III
4.	28.11.2016	While personally appearing before the Committee on 28 November, 2016 the Committee read over the contradictions appearing in his replies and again asked Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP to clarify his stand. After reconsidering, he orally submitted : "I want to state on record that my earlier replies may be restricted to the portion wherein I have tendered my humble and unconditional apology. The rest of the reply be treated as withdrawn."	IV
5.	06.12.2016	By an e-mail dated 06 December, 2016 received at 1301 hours Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP reiterated his earlier stand, vehemently denying that by any act of	V

1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---

omission or commission on his part, he breached the security arrangements of Parliament. He further denied that he conducted videography of the Parliament House Estate and its installations, security arrangements of Parliament House precincts or uploaded critical footage in the manner as alleged in the notice. Further, he submitted his humble and unconditional apology on the lines as stated by him in his earlier replies.

(Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP did not mention withdrawal of his earlier letters submitted to the Committee)

6. 06.12.2016 By an e-mail dated 06 December, 2016 received at 1602 hours Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP **while reiterating the contents of his earlier e-mail in the last submitted that "my submissions on 28 July, 2016 and 01 August, 2016 may be treated as withdrawn."** VI

Annexure

Statement showing use of Electronic Devices in the Parliaments of different countries.

APPENDIX I

Bhagwant Mann
Member of Parliament
(Lok Sabha)

144-146
South Avenue
New Delhi

Dated: 22/7/2016

Hon'ble Speaker Madam,

On 21st July, 2016, I came to give notice of Zero Hour and unknowingly video graphed the security and other related arrangements. My purpose was not to put the parliamentary security arrangements under threat. I wanted to make people aware of the procedure of asking questions. I tender unconditional apology on this matter. I also respect the temple of democracy and will never like to bring disgrace to this biggest temple of democracy.

I assure you that such mistake will not recur in future.

Sincerely your's

Sd/-

(BHAGWANT MANN)
IC No. 335

To,

Hon'ble Speaker
Lok Sabha
New Delhi.

APPENDIX II

S. BHAGWANT MANN
Member of Parliament
(Lok Sabha)
Sangrur, Punjab



Member:

- Standing Committee on Personnel, Public Grievances, Law & Justice
- Consultative Committee: Ministry of Rural Development, Panchayati Raj & Drinking Water & Sanitation
- Joint Committee on Offices of Profit

To,

Dated: 28th July, 2016

Joint Secretary (L)
Privileges & Ethics Branch
Parliament House

Dear Sir,

I have been informed *vide* your letter dated 25th July 2016 that a 'Committee to enquire into Improper Conduct of a Member', has been constituted to conduct an inquiry into the alleged breach of Parliament Security arrangements.

It is most respectfully, humbly and vehemently denied that I have by any act of omission or commission on my part breached the security arrangements of Parliament. I further deny that I have conducted videography of the Parliament House Estate and its installations, security arrangements of Parliament House precincts or have uploaded critical footage, in the manner as alleged in the said notice.

At this juncture, it is imperative to state that I have the highest respect and regard for august institution of Parliament House, its installations and its eminent members, all of whom collectively form the bedrock of our parliamentary democracy and is a shining testament to and hallmark of our commitment and endeavour to achieve for the common man of this great country, all the rights contemplated under the Constitution of India. I will never intentionally commit any act which will in any manner compromise/jeopardise the security and safety of Parliament House or its members. This was never my intention/objective and assuming for the sake of argument, without admitting that this has been the result of my act, the purpose of which I will allude in the succeeding part of the present reply, I do hereby tender my most humble and unconditional apology.

The footage which forms the basis of the present inquiry is of about 6 mins. and commences from Vijay Chowk at 8.50 and drove the distance of approximately 0.1 kms (100 metres) to Parliament House, entered through the gate, climbed up the short flight of stairs and entered the notice office.

It is the proceedings in this room that formed the purpose and objective of the recording, *i.e.* to show to the people of my constituency, the procedure followed for choosing matters that members are permitted to raise during Zero hour, which usually takes place from 12 pm to 1 pm. As you are well aware all members of Parliament who wish to raise a matter during Zero hour come to the notice room and either personally or through their staff drop chits in the box that is kept in the said room for this purpose. 20 of those chits are then randomly selected and those Members whose chits have been so selected are permitted to raise their matter. This system is virtually akin to a lottery and is not a matter of choice/discretion of individual members to raise matter as they please, this was the sole purpose of the entire exercise and nothing more.

Furthermore, it may be noted that footage showing the entry to Parliament House, the flight of stairs etc., is readily available in the public domain and it is not for the first time that it has so become available as is incorrectly being stated. This has been previously shown over the years by journalists, members and other persons. In fact, a video of 'virtual tour' of Parliament is uploaded on the website of Lok Sabha showing different parts, locations, Offices, buildings of the Indian Parliament. Therefore, it is wholly incorrect and baseless to suggest that the uploading of this footage has in any way compromised the safety of Parliament as alleged. [For example, here is a news report aired by a news channel on 21st July 2016 in the 8 to 9 pm segment in which 31.50 mins. onwards the same details/info is made available to the general public for viewing. <http://www.ndtv.com/video/shows/news-point/news-point-allegation-on-central-govt-is-govt-is-anti-dalit-424573>]. It is further a matter of common knowledge that close to the entry gate to Parliament, several OBU vans of various television networks are habitually stationed, and Live U/ satellite units are carried by journalists inside the Parliament compound, at all points of time and are involved in recording the ingress and egress of my sister and brother members of Parliament.

Sir, this Committee to conduct an inquiry and submit a report into the issue as to whether the short clip posed a threat to Parliament. In this regard another incident which is of crucial significance to the safety and security of our Nation also needs to be examined and I hope and trust that adequate attention will be devoted to examine this issue as well. As we are all aware, the Hon'ble Prime Minister Shri Narendra Modi ji had in the aftermath of the terrorist attack on the sensitive Pathankot Air base, invited a team from ISI to inspect the air base. Members of the ISI were permitted to visit the said sensitive base and conduct a recce, draw maps, identify locations, entry points etc. The ISI apart from being responsible for the attack on Parliament, as well as the one on Pathankot air base, is responsible for aiding and abetting terrorism in India. Therefore, it is only logical that the actions of the Hon'ble Prime Minister, which have compromised with National security, should also be inquired into and investigated.

Undeniably, this is a very serious security threat and I most humbly request you to kindly expand the mandate of the Committee and include the aforesaid

aspect in the scope of inquiry and also summon the Shri Narendra Modi ji before this Committee and seek his submission on the matter.

It is further pertinent to point out that there have been instances in the past where persons/members have recorded footage of Parliament House/entered the House in a vehicle bearing a fabricated sticker etc. and no action of any nature was taken. For example—In 2005 Parliament security found Lok Sabha MP Vijayendra Pal Singh's Mercedes car had a fake sticker, which allowed his car entry inside the premises. A defiant Singh claimed it was a deliberate attempt to show the loopholes in the security and was let off, even awarded with a Rajya Sabha berth later. (Here is a link to the news report: <http://www.indialivetoday.com/lok-sabha-mp-vijayendra-pal-singh-let-off-breaching-parliament-security-aam-aadmi-party-mp-bhagwant-mann-incident/15906.html>). Seen in this light the sudden alacrity shown in the present case is surprising to say the least.

I reiterate that I have not committed any act which would, amount to a breach of Security arrangements of Parliament and request that the present Inquiry be closed without any further action.

Sd/-

(BHAGWANT MANN)

IC-335

APPENDIX III

Dated: 1st August, 2016

To,

Joint Secretary(L)
Privileges & Ethics Branch
Lok Sabha Secretariat, Parliament House

Dear Sir,

I have been informed *vide* your letter dated 25th July, 2016 that a 'Committee to Enquire into Improper Conduct of a Member', has been constituted to conduct an inquiry into the alleged breach of Parliament Security arrangements.

It is most respectfully, humbly and vehemently denied that I have by any act of omission or commission on my part breached the security arrangements of Parliament. I further deny that I have conducted videography of the Parliament House Estate and its installations, security arrangements of Parliament House precincts or have uploaded critical footage, in the manner as alleged in the said notice.

At this juncture, it is imperative to state that I have the highest respect and regard for august institution of Parliament House, its installations and its eminent members, all of whom collectively form the bedrock of our parliamentary democracy and is a shining testament to and hallmark of our commitment and endeavour to achieve for the common man of this great country, all the rights contemplated under the Constitution of India. I will never intentionally commit any act which will in any manner compromise/jeopardise the security and safety of Parliament House or its members. This was never my intention/objective and assuming for the sake of argument, without admitting that this has been the result of my act, the purpose of which I will allude in the succeeding part of the present reply, I do hereby tender my most humble and unconditional apology.

The footage which forms the basis of the present inquiry is of about 6 mins. and commences from Vijay Chowk at 8.50am and drove the distance of approximately 0.1 kms (100 metres) to Parliament House, entered through the gate, climbed up the short flight of stairs and entered the notice office.

It is the proceedings in this room that formed the purpose and objective of the recording, *i.e.* to show to the people of my constituency, the procedure followed for choosing matters that members are permitted to raise during Zero Hour, which usually takes place from 12 pm to 1 pm. As you are well aware all members of Parliament who wish to raise a matter during Zero Hour come to the notice room and either personally or through their staff drop chits in the box that is kept in the said

room for this purpose. 20 of those chits are then randomly selected and those members whose chits have been so selected are permitted to raise their matter. This system is virtually akin to a lottery and is not a matter of choice/discretion of individual members to raise matter as they please. This was the sole purpose of the entire exercise and nothing more.

Furthermore, it may be noted that footage showing the entry to Parliament House, the flight of stairs etc., is readily available in the public domain and it is not for the first time that it has so become available as is incorrectly being stated. This has been previously shown over the years by journalists, members and other persons. In fact, a video of 'virtual tour' of Parliament is uploaded on the website of Lok Sabha showing different parts, locations, offices, buildings of the Indian Parliament. Therefore, it is wholly incorrect and baseless to suggest that the uploading of this footage has in any way compromised the safety of Parliament as alleged. [For example, here is a news report aired by a news channel on 21st July, 2016 in the 8 to 9 pm segment in which 31.50 mins. onwards the same details/info is made available to the general public for viewing. <http://www.ndtv.com/video/shows/news-point/news-point-allegation-on-central-govt-is-govt-is-anti-dalit-424573>]. It is further a matter of common knowledge that close to the entry gate to Parliament, several OB vans of various television networks are habitually stationed, and Live U/satellite units are carried by journalists inside the Parliament compound, at all points of time and are involved in recording the ingress and egress of my sister and brother members of Parliament.

Sir, this Committee to conduct an inquiry and submit a report into the issue as to whether the short clip posed a threat to Parliament. In this regard another incident which is of crucial significance to the safety and security of our Nation also needs to be examined and I hope and trust that adequate attention will be devoted to examine this issue as well. As we are all aware, the Hon'ble Prime Minister Shri Narendra Modi had in the aftermath of the terrorist attack on the sensitive Pathankot Air base, invited a team from ISI to inspect the air base. Members of the ISI were permitted to visit the said sensitive base and conduct a recce, draw maps, identify locations, entry points etc. The ISI apart from being responsible for the attack on Parliament, as well as the one on Pathankot air base, is responsible for aiding and abetting terrorism in India. Therefore, it is only logical that the actions of the Hon'ble Prime Minister, which have compromised with National security, should also be inquired into and investigated.

Undeniably, this is a very serious security threat and I most humbly request you to kindly expand the mandate of the Committee and include the aforesaid aspect in the scope of inquiry and also summon the Shri Narendra Modi ji before this Committee and seek his submission on the matter.

It is further pertinent to point out that there have been instances in the past where persons/members have recorded footage of Parliament House/entered the House in a vehicle bearing a fabricated sticker etc. and no action of any nature was taken. For example—in 2005 Parliament security found Lok Sabha

MP Vijayendra Pal Singh's Mercedes car had a fake sticker, which allowed his car entry inside the premises. A defiant Singh claimed it was a deliberate attempt to show the loopholes in the security and was let off, even awarded with a Rajya Sabha berth later. (Here is a link to the news report: <http://www.indialivetoday.com/lok-sabha-mp-vijayendra-pal-singh-left-off-breaching-parliament-security-aam-aadmi-party-mp-bhagwant-mann-incident/15906.html>). Seen in this light the sudden alacrity shown in the present case is surprising to say the least.

I reiterate that I have not committed any act which would amount to a breach of security arrangements of Parliament and request that the present Inquiry be closed without any further action.

Sd/-

(BHAGWANT MANN)
(Member of Parliament, IC-335)

APPENDIX IV

28.11.2016

श्री भगवंत मान: क्योंकि पहले मैं स्पीकर मैडम को माफी मांग चुका था, लेकिन उन्होंने मेरी माफी को नहीं एलाऊ किया, तो फिर उन्होंने कमेटी बना दी।

SHRIMATI MEENAKASHI LEKHI: That is it. Shri Mahtab, it is as clear as that.

श्री भगवंत मान: थोड़ा मौका मुझे और दीजिए।

SHRI BHARTRUHARI MAHTAB: Shri Mann, it is not that the Committee is not considerate towards you.

श्री भगवंत मान: मैं अभी दिल्ली में हूँ। Let me re-think about it. मुझे पहले अपने जवाब को पूरा पढ़ने दीजिए, जो कमेटी के सामने दिया है।

श्री भर्तृहरि महताब: अभी पढ़ लीजिए। अभी चेयरमैन साहब ने पढ़कर सुनाया।

श्री भगवंत मान: क्योंकि मैं पहली बार किसी कमेटी के सामने पेश हो रहा हूँ, मेरा एक्सपीरियंस इतना नहीं है। मेरा मकसद अभी भी ऐसा कुछ नहीं है। मुझे समझ में नहीं आता कि

श्री भर्तृहरि महताब: एक क्लेरिटी, जो चेयरमैन बार-बार पूछ रहे हैं, जैसा बहन लेखी जी बार-बार वही कह रही हैं, उसमें थोड़ा कंट्राडिक्शन है। जो स्पीकर मैडम को चिट्ठी लिखी गई और जो चिट्ठी हमारी कमेटी को आपने रिप्लाय दी है, उसमें थोड़ा कन्फ्यूजन है। उसे क्लेरिफाई अगर आप कर दें तो हमें रिपोर्ट बनाने के काम में आसानी होगी। इसलिए बार-बार यही चीज हम पूछ रहे हैं। आप अगर देखना चाहते हैं, जो कमेटी को चिट्ठी दिए थे, तो देख लीजिए।

श्री भगवंत मान: मुझे चिट्ठी दे दीजिए। कौन से वर्ड्स, क्या

श्री भर्तृहरि महताब: देख लीजिए, टाइम मत लीजिए।

Let it be easier for us. वैसे तो आज ही लास्ट डे है।

श्री भगवंत मान: मैं भी चाहता हूँ कि जल्दी हो जाए।

चेयरमैन साहब, आप कहां से पढ़कर सुना रहे थे।

माननीय सभापति: चौथा पेज पूरा और पांचवें पेज का लास्ट पैराग्राफ, जो दो सेंटेंस हैं।

It Starts with "Sir, this Committee to conduct inquiry...."

श्री भर्तृहरि महताब: आप पेज 2 देखिए, ऊपर जो पैराग्राफ है, लास्ट दो लाइनें- आपने इसमें लिखा है—

".....I will allude in the succeeding part of the present reply. I hereby tender my most humble and unconditional apology. This was never my intention, objective, and assuming for the sake of argument without admitting..."

यह किसी वकील ने लिखा होगा। क्या आप वकील हैं?

श्री भगवंत मान: जी नहीं।

श्री भर्तृहरि महताब: इसे देखिए।

It says, "Without admitting that this has been the result of my act, the purpose of which I will allude in the succeeding part of my present reply, I hereby tender my most humble and unconditional apology" आपने लिखा है।

श्री भगवंत मान: मैं आज इस पर आन रिकार्ड यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मेरे जवाब को यहीं तक माना जाए। इसके बाद जो उदाहरण दिए हैं, उन्हें रिकार्ड से हटा दीजिए।

श्रीमती मीनाक्षी लेखी: ये कह रहे हैं कि अनकंडिशनल ऐपॉलॉजी तक माना जाए, उससे आगे वाला जो प्रैजेंट किया है, उसे मैं विद्वृत्त कर रहा हूँ।

श्री भगवंत मान: मैंने आगे जो लिखा है कि विजेन्द्र पाल सिंह आए थे, प्रधान मंत्री आदि सब उदाहरण थे।

श्री आनंदराव अडसुल: मैंने आपको अकेले में भी समझाया था कि ऐसे मत कीजिए।

श्री भगवंत मान: मेरे जवाब को यहीं तक माना जाए और जो एग्जाम्पल दिए हैं उसे विद्वृत्त कर लिए जाएं।

HON. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you very much. The hon. Speaker has asked us to submit the report in this week end. So the Committee is planning to submit the report this week end.

श्री भगवंत मान: मैं चाहता हूँ कि मैं भी हाऊस में आकर अपनी बात कह सकूँ और जो भी डॉयरेक्शन होगा उसे मैं मानूँगा।

HON. CHAIRPERSON: The Secretariat will be able to send the draft report by today late night and we are sitting once again tomorrow to discuss the report.

(The committee then adjourned)

APPENDIX V

To,

Dated: 06 December, 2016

Director
Lok Sabha Secretariat
Privileges & Ethics Branch

Dear Sir,

I have been informed *vide* your letter dated 25th July, 2016 that a 'Committee to enquire into Improper Conduct of a Member', has been constituted to conduct an inquiry into the alleged breach of Parliament Security arrangements.

It is most respectfully, humbly and vehemently denied that I have by any act of omission or commission on my part breached the security arrangements of Parliament, I further deny that I have conducted videography of the, Parliament House Estate and its installations, security arrangements of Parliament House precincts or have uploaded critical footage, in the manner as alleged in the said notice.

At this juncture, it is imperative to state that I have the highest respect and regard for august institution of Parliament House, its installations and its eminent members, all of whom collectively form the bedrock of our parliamentary democracy and is a shining testament to and hallmark of our commitment and endeavour to achieve for the common man of this great country, all the rights contemplated under the Constitution of India. I will never intentionally commit any act which will in any manner compromise/jeopardise the security and safety of Parliament House or its members. This was never my intention/objective and assuming for the sake of argument, without admitting that this has been the result of my act, the purpose of which I will allude in the succeeding part of the present reply, I do hereby tender my most humble and unconditional apology.

Regards

Sd/-

(BHAGWANT MANN)
MP LS Sangrur PB
(IC 335)

APPENDIX VI

To,

Dated: 06 December, 2016

Director
Lok Sabha Secretariat
Privileges & Ethics Branch

Dear Sir,

I have been informed *vide* your letter dated 25th July, 2016 that a 'Committee to inquire into Improper Conduct of a Member', has been constituted to conduct an inquiry into the alleged breach of Parliament Security arrangements.

It is most respectfully, humbly and vehemently denied that I have by any act of omission or commission on my part breached the security arrangements of Parliament, I further deny that I have conducted videography of the, Parliament House Estate and its installations, security arrangements of Parliament House precincts or have uploaded critical footage, in the manner as alleged in the said notice.

At this juncture, it is imperative to state that I have the highest respect and regard for august institution of Parliament House, its installations and its eminent members, all of whom collectively form the bedrock of our parliamentary democracy and is a shining testament to and hallmark of our commitment and endeavour to achieve for the common man of this great country, all the rights contemplated under the Constitution of India. I will never intentionally commit any act which will in any manner compromise/jeopardise the security and safety of Parliament House or its members. This was never my intention/objective and assuming for the sake of argument, without admitting that this has been the result of my act, the purpose of which I will allude in the succeeding part of the present reply, I do hereby tender my most humble and unconditional apology. My submission on 28th July, 2016 and 01 August, 2016 may be treated as withdrawn.

Regards

Sd/-

(BHAGWANT MANN)
MPLS Sangrur PB
(IC 335)

**Statement showing use of Electronic devices in the Parliaments of
different countries**

Sl.No.	Country	Position pertaining to electronic device in different Parliaments
1	2	3
1.	Australia	The use of electronic devices in the chamber and Committees is permissible provided that it avoids interference or distraction to other Members either visually or audibly and does not interfere with proceedings-in particular, phone calls are not permitted and devices should be operated in silent mode. Permissibility of electronic devices is subject to condition that these devices are not used to record the proceedings (either by audio or visual means).
2.	Austria	Members are provided with electronic notebooks and may also use their own mobile devices (except mobile phones)
3.	Canada	Members may not use mobile phones or cameras but since 1994 they have been permitted to use laptop cameras in the Chamber provided that their use does not cause disorder or distract the Member who has the floor.
4.	Finland	Laptops are prohibited in the Chamber.
5.	France	Electronic Devices may not be used during question time.
6.	Greece	No electronic device are allowed. The Plenary Hall out of respect to the Member who is speaking.
7.	Ireland	All electronic devices are prohibited.
8.	House of Commons UK	That hand-held electronic devices (not laptops) may be used in the Chamber, provided that they are silent, and used in a way that does not impair decorum; that Members making speeches in the Chamber or in Committee may refer to electronic devices in place of paper speaking notes; and that electronic devices, including laptops, may be used silently in Committee meetings, including Select Committees.
9.	House of Lords UK	(i) Hand-held electronic devices (not laptops) may be used in the Chamber and Grand Committee provided that they are silent, but repeated use of such devices is discouraged. Members making speeches may refer to electronic devices in

1	2	3
		place of paper speaking notes, subject to the existing rule against reading speeches.
		(ii) Electronic devices may not be used to send or receive messages for use in proceedings. They may be used to access Parliamentary papers and other documents which are clearly and closely relevant to the business before the House or Grand Committee, but not to search the Web for information for use in debate which is not generally available to participants by other means.
		(iii) Electronic devices may be used silently in Select Committee meetings, subject to the discretion of the Chairman of the Committee on a meeting-by-meeting basis.
		(iv) In the following areas of the House, electronic devices must be silent and may not be used to hold conversation: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prince's Chamber 2. Peer's Lobby 3. Division lobbies during divisions 4. Library 5. Salisbury Room 6. Bars and Restaurants.
10.	New Zealand	Speaker has discretion to permit electronic devices and has permitted Members to use laptop computers provided that they are used silently and unobtrusively.
11.	US House of Representatives	A person on the floor of the House may not smoke or use a mobile electronic device that impairs decorum.

MINUTES

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO
IMPROPER CONDUCT OF A MEMBER HELD ON 25 JULY, 2016

The Committee sat on Monday, 25 July, 2016 from 1700 hrs. to 1842 hrs. in Room No. 53, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Kirit Somaiya — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Anandrao Adsul
3. Smt. Meenakashi Lekhi
4. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
5. Dr. (Smt.) Ratna De (Nag)
6. Shri Thota Narasimham
7. Dr. Satya Pal Singh (Baghpat)

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Anoop Mishra — *Secretary-General*
2. Shri Ravindra Garimella — *Joint Secretary*
3. Dr. Rajiv Mani — *Additional Director*

At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the members of the Committee at its first sitting. He referred to the mandate of the Committee i.e., (i) inquire into the serious security implications and related aspects germane to and arising out of the conduct of audio-visual recording around Parliament House Estate and in the installations situated within the Parliament House by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP on 21st July, 2016 and subsequent uploading of the said audio-visual recording by him on social media, (ii) suggest suitable remedial measures to avoid recurrence of such incidents in future, and (iii) recommend appropriate action in the matter as laid out by Hon'ble Speaker by her observation in the House today i.e., 25th July, 2016

(The Committee then viewed the video of the footage uploaded by Shri Bhagwant Mann on the social media).

2. Thereafter the Committee took on record the letter received from Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP seeking extension of time for filing his reply in the matter. The Committee after some deliberations granted Shri Mann extension of time upto 28 July, 2016 for filing his reply/comments.

3. The Committee thereafter deliberated on the modalities to be followed by it

to submit its report within the stipulated time. *i.e.* 3rd August, 2016. Members expressed their views on the issues involved *vis-a-vis* the mandate of the Committee. The Committee decided to hear the Commissioner, Delhi Police and the Joint Secretary (Security) and other Officers and Staff of Parliament Security Service and other officers of the Secretariat and also watch the available CCTV footage to have a better appraisal of the sequence of events along and the exact timeline of the video recording done by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP.

4. The Committee decided to meet again on 26, 27 and 28 July, 2016 in this regard.

(The Committee then adjourned.)

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO
IMPROPER CONDUCT OF A MEMBER HELD ON 26 JULY, 2016

The Committee sat on Tuesday, 26 July, 2016 from 1500 hrs. to 1730 hrs. in Room No. 62, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Kirit Somaiya — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Anandrao Adsul
3. Smt. Meenakashi Lekhi
4. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
5. Dr. (Smt.) Ratna De (Nag)
6. Shri Thota Narasimham
7. Dr. Satya Pal Singh (Baghpat)
8. Shri K.C. Venugopal
9. Dr. P. Venugopal

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Ravindra Garimella — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri M.K. Madhusudhan — *Director*
3. Dr. Rajiv Mani — *Additional Director*

WITNESSES

Delhi Police

1. Shri Alok Kumar Verma, Commissioner of Police
2. Shri Mukesh Kumar Meena, Spl. Commissioner of Police, New Delhi
3. Shri S.B.S. Tyagi, Addl. Commissioner of Police, Security

Lok Sabha Secretariat

Shri Yogesh Deshmukh, Joint Secretary (Security)

At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the members of the Committee to enquire into Improper Conduct of a Member to the sitting and apprised them that as agreed by the Committee the officers of Delhi Police and the Joint Secretary in-charge of Security in the Lok Sabha Secretariat have been called to brief the

Committee about the incident of audio-visual recording in and around Parliament House by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP on 21 July, 2016 and subsequent uploading of the said audio-visual recording by him on the social media.

2. After brief deliberations on certain issues the Committee called Shri Alok Kumar Verma, Commissioner of Police, Delhi and examined him on oath. Shri Alok Kumar Verma apprised the Committee of the role of Delhi Police in securing the areas around Parliament House Complex and the related responsibilities and the security implications arising out of the video uploaded by Shri Bhagwant Mann on social media. He responded to the queries and clarifications sought by the Members. The Committee directed Shri Alok Kumar Verma to furnish a copy of the CCTV footage relating to the vehicular movement of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP.

(The witnesses, then, withdrew)

3. Thereafter, the Committee called Shri Yogesh Deshmukh, Joint Secretary (Security) and examined him on oath. Shri Deshmukh, with the consent of the Committee played the CCTV footage relating to the entry of Shri Bhawant Mann, MP into the Parliament House Complex through Iron Gate No. 1 from Vijay Chowk side on 21 July, 2016. He also responded to the queries and clarifications raised by the Members. The Committee directed Shri Yogesh Deshmukh to furnish a copy of the CCTV footage in possession of the Parliament Security Service to them for their record.

(The witnesses, then, withdrew)

4. The Committee then decided to hear other officials of Parliament Security Service at its next sitting on 27 July, 2016.

(Verbatim record of the evidence was kept.)

The Committee, then, adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO
IMPROPER CONDUCT OF A MEMBER HELD ON 27 JULY, 2016

The Committee sat on Wednesday, 27 July, 2016 from 1500 hrs. to 1607 hrs. in Room No. 63, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Kirit Somaiya — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Smt. Meenakashi Lekhi
3. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
4. Dr. (Smt.) Ratna De (Nag)
5. Shri Thota Narasimham
6. Dr. Satya Pal Singh (Baghpat)
7. Shri K.C. Venugopal
8. Dr. P. Venugopal

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Ravindra Garimella — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri M.K. Madhusudhan — *Director*
3. Dr. Rajiv Mani — *Additional Director*

WITNESS

Shri G.S. Guleria — *Additional Director (Security)*

At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the members of the Committee to enquire into Improper Conduct of a Member to the sitting and apprised them that as agreed by the Committee the officers and staff of Parliament Security Service have been called to brief the Committee about the movement of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP when he entered the Parliament House Complex through the Iron-1 (Vijay Chowk Side) on 21 July, 2016.

2. Thereafter, the Committee called Shri G.S. Guleria, Additional Director (Security) who is in-charge of Iron Gate-1 and examined on oath. He was also accompanied by the Staff of the Parliament Security Service manning the Iron Gate-1 on 21 July, 2016 when the vehicle in which Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP was travelling entered the Parliament House through the Vijay Chowk Side. He briefed the Committee of the security arrangements at Iron Gate-1 (PH) and the facts as

observed by the Parliament Security Service when Shri Mann, MP entered the Parliament House on 21st July, 2016.

(The witness, then, withdrew)

3. The Committee was informed about a request from Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP to appear before the Committee for his evidence along with a counsel. The Committee in view of Rule 271 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha decided to inform Shri Mann of its decision in this regard after consulting the Hon'ble Speaker.

4. The Committee thereafter decided to meet again on 28 July, 2016 to hear the version of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP after going through the written comments to be furnished by him to the Lok Sabha Secretariat within the extended time sought by him.

(Verbatim record of the evidence was kept.)

(The Committee, then, adjourned)

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO
IMPROPER CONDUCT OF A MEMBER HELD ON 28 JULY, 2016

The Committee sat on Thursday, 28 July, 2016 from 1500 hrs. to 1615 hrs. in
Room No. G-074, Parliament Library Building, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Kirit Somaiya — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Anandrao Adsul
3. Smt. Meenakashi Lekhi
4. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
5. Dr. (Smt.) Ratna De (Nag)
6. Shri Thota Narasimham
7. Dr. Satya Pal Singh (Baghpat)
8. Shri K.C. Venugopal
9. Dr. P. Venugopal

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Ravindra Garimella — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri M.K. Madhusudhan — *Director*
3. Dr. Rajiv Mani — *Additional Director*

WITNESS

Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP.

At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the members of the Committee and apprised them that Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP has since submitted his comments to the Secretariat today within the extended time granted to him and is also present to tender his evidence before the Committee in the matter.

2. The Committee then called Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP and examined him on oath. The Committee asked Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP to amend or revise his comments, if he so desires and furnish the same within a period of two days. The Committee also decided to hear him further at its next sitting on 1st August, 2016.

(The witness, then, withdrew)

(Verbatim record of the evidence was kept.)

(The Committee, then, adjourned)

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO
IMPROPER CONDUCT OF A MEMBER HELD ON 01 AUGUST, 2016

The Committee sat on Monday, 01 August, 2016 from 1500 hrs. to 1702 hrs. in Room No. 139, Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Kirit Somaiya — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Anandrao Adsul
3. Smt. Meenakashi Lekhi
4. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
5. Dr. (Smt.) Ratna De (Nag)
6. Shri Thota Narasimham
7. Dr. Satya Pal Singh (Baghpat)
8. Shri K.C. Venugopal
9. Dr. P. Venugopal

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Ravindra Garimella — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri M.K. Madhusudhan — *Director*
3. Dr. Rajiv Mani — *Additional Director*

WITNESS

Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP

At the outset, Hon'ble Chairperson apprised the Members that pursuant to opportunity provided to him, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP has submitted his revised comments again on 1st August, 2016 wherein he has reiterated what he has stated in his earlier comments submitted to the Committee on 28 July, 2016. The Committee after deliberations opined that Shri Bhagwant Mann had made no attempt to clarify or explain the contradictions which prevailed in his earlier reply. The Committee also discussed about the statements made by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP in the media on 21 July, 2016 about his facebook post of the videography of security arrangements in Parliament House Complex.

2. The Chairperson further briefed the Committee about the pending work namely field visit, evidence of officials and security experts etc., and that the same

cannot be completed by 3 August, 2016 the time limit for submitting of the report and therefore an extension of time is required. The Committee, accordingly authorised the Hon'ble Chairperson to seek two weeks extension of time to complete the pending work before the submission of the report of the Committee.

3. Thereafter, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP was called and examined on oath. The Committee sought to enquire from him *inter alia* about the unresolved contradictions which still remain in his reply dated 01 August, 2016 despite the opportunity availed by him in this regard, to which he responded.

(The witness, then, withdrew)

(Verbatim record of the evidence was kept)

(The Committee, then, adjourned)

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO
IMPROPER CONDUCT OF A MEMBER HELD ON 10 AUGUST, 2016

The Committee sat on Wednesday, 10 August, 2016 from 1600 hrs. to 1710 hrs. in Room No. 62, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Kirit Somaiya — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Smt. Meenakashi Lekhi
3. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
4. Dr. (Smt.) Ratna De (Nag)
5. Dr. Satya Pal Singh (Baghpat)
6. Dr. P. Venugopal

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri M.K. Madhusudhan — *Director*
2. Dr. Rajiv Mani — *Additional Director*

WITNESSES

1. Shri Kishan Kumar — Security Officer, PSS
2. Shri Rajkumar — Senior Security Assistant, PSS
3. Shri Rajnish Kumar Rana — Senior Security Assistant, PSS

At the outset, Hon'ble Chairperson welcomed the Members to the Sitting and apprised them of the developments that took place since last sitting including the on-spot inspection undertaken by the Committee on 4 August, 2016 of the route between Vijay Chowk to Iron Gate No. 1 of the Parliament House Building and Gate No. 1 of Parliament House and reviewed the security arrangements in place for regulating the entry of vehicles and their occupants into Parliament House Complex.

2. Thereafter, the Committee took stock of the work done by them so far and the time frame that would be required for finalising and presenting the Report to Hon'ble Speaker. After some deliberations, the Members were of the view that given the extended weekend and holidays following thereto, the Committee would not have enough time at their disposal to take evidence of other witnesses including further evidence of Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP, if required and security experts besides internal meetings which would be required for finalising the Report. The Committee were of the unanimous view that since some more time is required for

them to examine various aspects of the subject, extension of time till the last day of the first week of the next session of Lok Sabha may be sought from Hon'ble Speaker for presentation of the Report. The Committee authorized the Chairperson to take up the matter with Speaker, Lok Sabha in this regard and consequential action thereto be taken by the Secretariat.

3. Thereafter, the Committee called in Shri Kishan Kumar, Security Officer and his colleagues who were on duty at Building Gate No. 1, PH on 21 July, 2016 at the time when Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP entered the Parliament House and examined them on oath.

(The witnesses, then, withdrew)

(Verbatim record of the evidence was kept.)

(The Committee, then, adjourned).

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO
IMPROPER CONDUCT OF A MEMBER HELD ON 23 AUGUST, 2016

The Committee sat on Wednesday, 23 August, 2016 from 1600 hrs. to 1740 hrs. in Room No. 62, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Kirit Somaiya — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Anandrao Adsul
3. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
4. Dr. (Smt.) Ratna De (Nag)
5. Dr. Satya Pal Singh (Baghpat)
6. Dr. P. Venugopal

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Ravindra Garimella — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri M.K. Madhusudhan — *Director*
3. Dr. Rajiv Mani — *Additional Director*

WITNESS

Shri Babu Rao — Deputy Secretary, PNO, Lok Sabha Secretariat

At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee and apprised them about the agenda of the sitting. The Committee then briefly discussed on the course of action to be taken by them in subsequent sittings.

2. Thereafter, the Committee called Shri C. Babu Rao, Deputy Secretary, PNO, Lok Sabha Secretariat and examined him on oath.

(Verbatim record of his evidence was kept.)

(The official then withdrew.)

3. Thereafter Shri Yogesh Deshmukh, Joint Secretary (Security), along with his colleagues from Parliamentary Security Service were called in, who apprised the Committee of the Security implications arising out of the conduct of the Member under examination and also gave suggestions to augment/further strengthening of the security arrangements in and around Parliament House Complex.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO
IMPROPER CONDUCT OF A MEMBER HELD ON 21 SEPTEMBER, 2016

The Committee sat on Wednesday, 21 September, 2016 from 1530 hrs. to 1640 hrs. in Room No. 63, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Kirit Somaiya — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Anandrao Adsul
3. Shrimati Meenakashi Lekhi
4. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
5. Dr. (Smt.) Ratna De (Nag)
6. Shri Thota Narasimham
7. Dr. Staya Pal Singh (Baghpat)
8. Shri K.C. Venugopal
9. Dr. P. Venugopal

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Ravindra Garimella — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri M.K. Madhusudhan — *Director*
3. Dr. Rajiv Mani — *Additional Director*

WITNESSES

Delhi Police

1. Shri Alok Kumar Verma — Commissioner of Police
2. Shri Mukesh Kumar — Spl. Commissioner of Police,
Meena New Delhi
3. Shri S.B.S. Tyagi — Addl. Commissioner of Police, Security

At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the Members to the sitting and apprised them that the sitting of the Committee had been convened for a briefing by the Commissioner of Delhi Police and his colleagues on the need for strengthening of security arrangements in and around Parliament House in the backdrop of security concerns arising out of the incident of video recording of Parliament House Complex and uploading of the video-footage on social media by a Member. Thereafter,

Shri Alok Kumar Verma, Commissioner of Police, Delhi along with his colleagues were called in. The Commissioner, then briefed the Committee of the various aspects concerning the subject. He also responded to the queries raised by Members on the subject. The Committee also, directed Shri Alok Kumar Verma to send his suggestions in the matter in writing, for the consideration of the Committee.

(The witnesses, then, withdrew.)

(Verbatim record of the evidence was kept.)

2. The Committee decided to hear the other security experts at their next sitting.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO THE
IMPROPER CONDUCT OF A MEMBER HELD ON 10 NOVEMBER, 2016

The Committee sat on Thursday, 10 November, 2016 from 1430 hrs. to 1515 hrs. in Room No. 53, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Kirit Somaiya — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Smt. Meenakashi Lekhi
3. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
4. Shri Thota Narasimham
5. Dr. P. Venugopal

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Ravindra Garimella — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri M.K. Madhusudhan — *Director*
3. Dr. Rajiv Mani — *Additional Director*

WITNESS

Shri Vikram Srivastava — *IPS (Retd.), former DG CRPF*

At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the Members to the sitting which had been convened for having a briefing from Shri Vikram Srivastava, IPS (Retd.) former Director General, CRPF and an eminent Security Expert, on the security concerns arising out of the incident of video recording of Parliament House and uploading of the video footage on social media by Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP and the consequent need for strengthening of security arrangements in and around Parliament House. Thereafter, Shri Vikram Srivastava, who was present was called in.

2. Shri Srivastava, briefed the Committee of the security implications of the act of videography by the Member and also suggested measures for beefing up/strengthening the security arrangements in the Parliament House. He also responded to the queries raised by Members on the subject.

(The witness, then, withdrew.)

(Verbatim record of the evidence was kept.)

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO THE
IMPROPER CONDUCT OF A MEMBER HELD ON 17 NOVEMBER, 2016

The Committee sat on Thursday, 17 November, 2016 from 1500 hrs. to 1530 hrs. in Room No. 62, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Kirit Somaiya — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Smt. Meenakashi Lekhi
3. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
4. Dr. (Smt.) Ratna De (Nag)
5. Shri Thota Narasimham
6. Dr. Satya Pal Singh (Baghpat)
7. Shri K.C. Venugopal
8. Dr. P. Venugopal

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Ravindra Garimella — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri M.K. Madhusudhan — *Director*
3. Dr. Rajiv Mani — *Additional Director*

At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the Members to the sitting and apprised them that the sitting of the Committee had been convened to chalk out the further course of action.

2. The Chairperson solicited the views of the Members, as the Committee have been given time upto Friday, 18 November, 2016 to present the Report and at this stage the Committee is not in a position to submit the same and therefore further extension of time is required. The Committee after some deliberations decided to seek further extension of two weeks more time from Hon'ble Speaker *w.e.f.* 19 November, 2016 and authorised the Chairperson to take up the matter with the Hon'ble Speaker and for consequential necessary action in this regard.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO THE
IMPROPER CONDUCT OF A MEMBER HELD ON 22 NOVEMBER, 2016

The Committee sat on Tuesday, 22 November, 2016 from 1500 hrs. to 1535 hrs.
in Room No. 63, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Kirit Somaiya — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Anandrao Adsul
3. Smt. Meenakashi Lekhi
4. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
5. Shri Thota Narasimham
6. Dr. Satya Pal Singh (Baghpat)
7. Dr. P. Venugopal

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Ravindra Garimella — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri M.K. Madhusudhan — *Director*
3. Dr. Rajiv Mani — *Additional Director*

At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the Members to the sitting. The Chairperson then informed the Members that Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP who was to appear before the Committee had sent an e-mail stating that he did not wish to amend, alter or add anything to his submissions and requested to treat his previously made submission as final and adjudicate accordingly. The Chairperson also apprised the Members that however, Shri Mann, had informed the Committee Secretariat on telephone that if the Committee still desired that his presence was essential, he could appear before the Committee only after 26 November, 2016.

2. Thereafter, the Chairperson solicited the views of Members in this regard. The Committee after deliberations decided to hear Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP at their next sitting on 28 November, 2016. The Committee also directed the Secretariat to prepare a Draft Report for their consideration, at their sitting on 29 November, 2016.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO THE
IMPROPER CONDUCT OF A MEMBER HELD ON 28 NOVEMBER, 2016

The Committee sat on Monday, 28 November, 2016 from 1500 hrs. to 1615 hrs.
in Room No. 63, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Kirit Somaiya — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Anandrao Adsul
3. Smt. Meenakashi Lekhi
4. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
5. Dr. (Smt.) Ratna De (Nag)
6. Shri Thota Narasimham
7. Dr. Satya Pal Singh (Baghpat)

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Ravindra Garimella — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri M.K. Madhusudhan — *Director*
3. Dr. Rajiv Mani — *Additional Director*

WITNESS

Shri Bhagwant Mann — MP

At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the Members to the sitting. He then informed the Members that Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP who could not appear in the previous sitting due to his prior engagements, is present today for deposing before the Committee.

2. The Committee then called in Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP and examined him on Oath. The members, while pointing out the inherent contradiction/inconsistencies in the replies/statement dated 28 July and 1 August, 2016 as furnished by Shri Mann to the Committee, gave him a last chance/opportunity to take a clear cut stand in the matter, devoid of any ambiguities.

3. Thereupon, Shri Bhagwant Mann, MP stated that he wish to partially revise his reply and requested the Committee for taking on record the unconditional apology as submitted by him in the reply and to treat the rest of the portion, as withdrawn. The Committee acceded to his request.

(The witness then withdrew.)

(Verbatim record of his evidence was kept.)

Hon'ble Chairperson directed the Secretariat to circulate the draft Report in the matter for the consideration and adoption of the Committee at their sitting to be held on 29 November, 2016.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE TO INQUIRE INTO
IMPROPER CONDUCT OF A MEMBER HELD ON 29 NOVEMBER, 2016

The Committee sat on Tuesday, 29 November, 2016 from 1500 hrs. to 1610 hrs.
in Room No. 62, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Dr. Kirit Somaiya — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Anandrao Adsul
3. Smt. Meenakashi Lekhi
4. Shri Bhartruhari Mahtab
5. Dr. (Smt.) Ratna De (Nag)
6. Shri Thota Narasimham
7. Dr. Satya Pal Singh (Baghpat)
8. Shri K.C. Venugopal
9. Dr. P. Venugopal

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri Ravindra Garimella — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri M.K. Madhusudhan — *Director*
3. Dr. Rajiv Mani — *Additional Director*

At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the Members to the Sitting of the Committee and informed that the Secretariat has circulated the draft Report. The Committee, thereafter took up the draft Report for consideration and finalization.

2. The Members gave their views/suggestions on the draft Report. After detailed deliberations, the Chairperson informed the Members that the draft Report duly incorporating the changes, as suggested by the Members, will be recirculated, for information of Members.

3. The Committee also authorized the Chairperson to take all necessary steps to finalize the Report and present the same to the Speaker and thereafter to the House.

The Committee then adjourned.