

LOCAL FUND AUDIT, CUTTACK, ODISHA

CATEGORY : Municipality/Municipal Corporation

Audit Report No : 600994/AR/2020-2021-CUTTACK

PARA: 1 TITLE SHEET

1	Name of the Institution :	Choudwar Municipality
2	Year of Accounts under Audit :	2019-2020
3	Name of the Local Authority during the year of A/Cs :	1. SRI SATYABRATA MANTRY, EO 15.02.2019 TO 31.10.2019 2. SRI PABITRA KUMAR BEHERA, EO, 1.11.2019 TO 31.03.2020
	Name of the Local Authority at the time of Audit :	SRI PABITRA KUMAR BEHERA, OAS,
4	Duration of Audit :	27-01-2021 To 15-04-2021 (Mandays Consumed :- 61.5)
5	Name of the Auditors :	SARADA PRASAD MOHANTY - Auditor(27-01-2021 to 15-04-2021) NIRANJAN BEHERA - Lead Auditor(27-01-2021 to 15-04-2021) NARENDRA MOHARANA - Auditor(13-03-2021 to 15-04-2021)
6	Name of the Reviewing Officer :	KUMUDA BIHARI LENKA(Audit Superintendent)
7	Date of submission of report by Reviewing officer :	01-06-2021
8	Entry Conference Date :	
9	Exit Conference Date :	
10	Name of the District Audit Officer :	DILLIP KUMAR NAYAK
11	Date of approval of report by District Audit Officer :	03-08-2021

Para1.1 :- Demographic information:-

Name Of The Institution	Area In sq Km	No of Ward	Population of the Institution					Female Population	Male Population
			S.C	S.T	Minority	General	Total		
Choudwar Municipality	31.08	19	7414	1380	0	44205	52999	25303	27696

PARA: 2 PHYSICAL VERIFICATION

S/no	Items	Date Of Physical verification Before / After Transaction	Physical Balance	Balance As per Cash Book / Stock Register	Reference To The Page No Of Cash Book / Stock Register	Discrepancies If Any

1	Others					
2	Service Postage Stamps	27.1.2021	252	252	Page- 32 of SPS SR	nil
3	Miscellaneous Receipt Books	27.01.2021	262	262	Page-8 of Receipt Book SR	Nil
4	Measurement Books	27.01.2021	0	0	Page-61 of Office Stationery S.R	Nil
5	Cash in hand	27.01.2021	81246.00	81246.00	Subsidiary Cash Book Page No-155 collected on 27.1.21 and deposited on 28.1.20	Nil
6	6. Holding Tax Receipt book	27.01.2021	39	39	Page 4 of Receipt Book SR	Nil

Comments

As required under Rule 20(a) of Odisha Local Fund Audit Rules, 1951, the physical verification of hard cash, unused receipt books, unused Measurement Books, Cycle and rickshaw token and public postage stamps etc. has been conducted on the date of commencement of audit i.e. on 21.01.2012 before transaction and the result of verification has been recorded vide P.No. 155 of subsidiary cash book which is furnished as above. The result of physical verification found tallied with Cash Book and Stock Register.

As per OM Rule 1951, the retention of cash balance in hand prescribed limit is Rs. 10000.00 provided that if the head quarter is situated at a place with no Treasury or Sub-Treasury, then money can be held to a maximum of Rs.20000.00. On verifying & Checking of the Cash book, it is found that cash amounting to Rs 81426.00 is kept in hand as hard cash which is violate the rule. The local authority is suggested to adhere the prescribed limit for all time to come and compliance reported to audit.

PARA: 3 LIST OF VERIFIED RECORDS

A : List Of Verified Records/Register			
S/no	List Records/Register	Rules	Form No
1	Abstract Register of Receipts	Rule 129	Form No. XV
2	Abstract Register of Expenditure	Rule 129	Form No. XVI
3	Register of adjustments	Rule 132	Form No. XVII
4	Register of Outstanding Advances	Rule 140	Form No. XIX
5	Advance Ledger	Rule 136	Form No. XVIII
6	Deposit Ledger	Rule 142	Form No. XX
7	Register of Quarterly & Annual account of Expenditure	Rule 144	Form No. XXIII
8	Annual Account of Receipts and Expenditure	Rule 145	Form No. XXIV
9	Loan Register	Rule 149	Form No. XXVII
10	Register of Investments	Rule 148	Form No. XXVI
11	Stock account of Receipt Forms	Rule 196	Form L
12	Tax collector's daily collection register	Rule 192	Form K
13	Appropriation Register of Loan Funds	Rule 150	Form No. XXVIII
14	Miscellaneous Receipts	Rule 157	Form No. XXXIV
15	Register of Lands	Rule 160	Form No. XXXV
16	Register of Rents for which there is fixed demand	Rule 163	Form No. XXXVI
17	Ledger of Lessees	Rule 170	Form No. XXXVIII
18	Arrear List	Rule 170	Form No. XXXIX
19	Daily Collection Register	Rule 171	Form No. XL
20	Register of Interest Bearing Securities	Rule 147	Form No. XLI
21	Stock account of Tickets used for daily collection of Market fees	Rule 171	Form No. XLIII
22	Stamp Account	Rule 172	Form No. XLIV
23	Stock Register of Stationery	Rule 172	Form No. XLIV
24	Assessment List	Rule 177	Form A
25	Tax Ledger (personal A/C of Tax Payers)	Rule 178	Form B(I)
26	Demand and Collection Register	Rule 178	Form B
27	Arrear Demand Register	Rule 187	Form H

28	Tax Receipt Form	Rule 188	Form I
29	Register of writes off of demands	Rule 190	Form J
30	Tax collector's Ledger	Rule 198	Form M
31	Progress statement of collection of taxes	Rule 200	Form N
32	Notice of demand for tax u/s-161 of OM Act	Rule 202	Form O
33	Distrain Warrant Register	Rule 202	Form P
34	Form of inventory & Notice	Rule 203	Form Q
35	Warrant register	Rule 202	Form R
36	Register of Distrained property & sales	Rule 204	Form S
37	Register of Estimates & Allotments	Rule 332	Form W-I
38	Nominal Muster Roll (NMR)	Rule 340	Form W-II
39	Contract Agreement Form	Rule 341	Form W-III
40	Contract Certificate	Rule 343	Form W-IV
41	Miscellaneous Supply Bill	Rule 343	Form W-V
42	Register of Works	Rule 345	Form W-VI
43	Cash Book of the municipality	Rule 125	Form No. XIV
44	Voucher of Recoupment of Permanent Advance Account	Rule 110	Form No. XIII
45	Permanent Advance Account	Rule 108	Form No. XII
46	Periodical Increment Certificate	Rule 99	Form No. XI
47	Absentee Statement	Rule 97	Form No. X
48	Salary Bills	Rule 97	Form No. IX
49	Subsidiary Cash Book	Rule 128 A	Form No. V-A
50	Cashier's Cash Book	Rule 81	Form No. V
51	Schedule for the Budget Estimate	Rule 77	Form No. III
52	Abstract of the Budget Estimate	Rule 74	Form No. I-A
53	Budget Estimate	Rule 74	Form No. I
54	Stock & Store Register of Municipality	Rule 346	Form W-VII
55	Measurement Book	Rule 365	Form W-VIII

B : List of Records/Registers not Produced to Audit

S/no	List Records/Register	Rules	Form No

C : List of Records/Registers not Maintained

S/no	List Records/Register	Rules	Form No

1	Register of outstanding deposits	Rule 143	Form No. XXI
2	Register of Quarterly & Annual account of Receipt	Rule 144	Form No. XXII
3	Register of the Tax on Carriages, Carts, Horses and Other animals	Rule 151	Form No. XXIX
4	License for Carriages, Carts, Horses Other and animals	Rule 154	Form No. XXX
5	License Register for Drivers and Owners of Carriages plying for hire	Rule 156	Form No. XXXIII
6	Jamabandi Register	Rule 170	Form No. XXXVII
7	Register of Grants	Rule 80	Form No. XLII
8	Mutation Register	Rule 184	Form G
9	Register of Petitions	Rule 183	Form F
10	Form of appeal petition	Rule 183	Form E
11	Order Book	Rule 96	Form No. VIII
12	Register of Bills	Rule 96	Form No. VII
13	Challan	Rule 87	Form No. VI
14	Subsidiary account of special taxes	Rule 79	Form No.-IV

D : List of Records/Registers not Required

S/no	List Records/Register	Rules	Form No
------	-----------------------	-------	---------

Comments

No comments.

PARA: 4 FINANCIAL POSITION

Choudwar Municipality - 2019-2020

S/no	Name of the Cash Book	OB as on Date	Opening Balance(In Rs:)	Receipt during the Year under Audit(In Rs:)	Total(In Rs:)	Expenditure during the Year under Audit(In Rs:)	Closing Balance as per Audit (DD MM YYYY)	Closing Balance (In Rs:)(AUDIT)	Closing Balance as per (DD MM YYYY) Cash Book	Closing Balance(In Rs:)(CASH BOOK)	Difference(In Rs:)	Remarks
1	NULM	01-04-2	658570	270469	929039	571438	31-03-2	357601	31-03-2	357601	0.00	

		019	.00	.00	.00	.00	020	.00	020	.00		
2	Biju Juba Bhaini	01-04-2019	628117.00	9643.00	637760.00	620000.00	31-03-2020	17760.00	30-11--0001	17760.00	0.00	
3	OAP.O DP. NOAP	01-04-2019	678507.70	328178.82	396029.59	349525.54	30-11--0001	465040.50	30-11--0001	465040.50	0.00	
4	NFSA Cash Book	01-04-2019	353102.92	678034.30	103113.63	828672.55	31-03-2020	202463.82	30-11-2022	183525.45	189383.92	
5	SBM	01-04-2019	333973.67	134710.58	468684.25	181760.50	31-03-2020	450508.20	31-03-2020	413228.77	372794.30	
6	SJRY Cash Book	01-04-2019	4353.00	0.00	4353.00	0.00	31-03-2020	4353.00	31-03-2020	4353.00	0.00	
7	PA CASH BOOK	01-04-2019	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	31-03-2020	100.00	31-03-2020	100.00	0.00	
8	Accountant Cash Book	01-04-2019	925492.19	178282.08	270831.30	134143.75	31-03-2020	136687.54	31-03-2020	137049.02	-36148.94	
	GRAND TOTAL		137553823.92	231631478.37	369185302.29	180392082.44		188793219.85		185237373.87	3555845.98	

Comments

Accountant Cash Book		
Sl. No.	PARTICULARS	AMOUNT
1	C.B As per Cash Book as on 31.03.2020	137049023..37
2	Difference rolling from last Audit figure	-648190.94
3	Add grant received on 18.3.2020 but reflected in cash book ICICI cash book No.101305003241(HSY)	+286710.00
4	C.B. as per audit as on 31.3.20	136687542.43

Reconciliation of the difference between audit C.B and Cash book C.B

1	Sale Center Cash Book	C.B As per Cash Book as on 31.03.2020	1835254.50
	Less OB shown in cash book on 4/16		151790.1
	Excess expenditure shown in cash book on 5/16		158

	(97655-97813)	
	Less expenditure shown in cash book on 8/16 (327479.00-293686.00)	-33793
	Less expenditure shown in cash book on 9/16 (351717-350274)	-1443
	Excess CB shown in cash book on 9/16 (2036674.05-2036674.00)	-0.95
	Less expenditure shown in cash book on 11/16 (483961.00-284074.00)	-199887
	Excess expenditure shown in cash book on 12/16 (262339-269047)	6708
	Excess expenditure shown in cash book on 1/17 (130118-328979)	198861
	Less expenditure shown in cash book on 2/17 (271585-248678)	-22907
	Excess expenditure shown in cash book on 3/17 (271862-289724)	17862
	Less CB shown in cash book on 9/16 (2036674-2071910)	35236
	Less CB shown in cash book on 11/16 (2019170.95-2019172.95)	2
	Less OB shown in cash book on 3/17(2095055.95-2095055.45)	0.5
	Less receipt shown in cash book on 3/17 but taken in to cash book on 4/17(397785-453867)	56082
	In Cash Book as per Audit Shown wrongly as 2801126.87 instead of Rs 2820411.60 i.e Less Shown =	-19284.73
	C.B As per Audit as on 31.3.2019	2024638.42
2	SBM CASH BOOK	C.B As per Cash Book as on 31.03.2020
		41322877
	Add difference narrated in Last AR No 253088/16-17	123213
	Last year Cash Book CB as on 31.3.18 is shown Rs 24957756.00,where as the OB as on 1.4.18 is taken as 21353026.00, which is the only balance of ICICI Account No 101301000488. The Axis Bank Balance of Rs 3341718.00 as on	3604730
	31.3.18 is left out for which separate objection memo is issued.	
	C.B As per Audit as on 31.3.2020	45050820

4.1: Details of Closing balance as per cash book

The details of closing balance as per different cash books as on 31-03-2020 is given below.

NAME OF THE CASH BOOK	BANK	CASH	TREASURY	TOTAL
Accountant Cash Book	41374294.10	6246.00	95668483.27	137049023.37
NULM	357601.00	0.00	0.00	357601.00
Biju Juba Bahini	17760.00	0.00	0.00	17760.00
OAP	4650405.00	0.00	0.00	4650405.00
PDS	1835254.5	0.00	0.00	1835254.50
PA CASH BOOK	0.00	100.00	0.00	100.00
SJRY	4353	0.00	0.00	4353.00
SBM	41322877	0.00	0.00	41322877.00
TOTAL	89562544.60	6346.00	95668483.27	185237373.87

The detailed statement of both receipt and expenditure in respect of Accountant cash book is furnished in **Annexure - I & II** attached to this report.

4.2 Non-maintenance of cash book under Double Entry Accrual Based Accounting System (DEABAS)

It is to mention here that adoption of modern accrual based, double entry system of accounting was first mandatory for ULB level reform set by the Govt. of India. The State Govt. decided to introduce double entry system of accrual based accounting in ULBs across the state during 2007. The Odisha Municipal (Accounts) Rules, 2012 was notified in July 2012 requiring all municipalities to maintain their Books of Account on accrual basis under the double entry system of book-keeping and data based formats. Govt. in H & UD Department has instructed all the ULBs for implementation of Double Entry Accrual Based Accounting System (DEABAS) as per Odisha Municipal Accounts Rules -2012 in ULBs w.e.f. 1.10.2013. the same has not yet been properly implemented in this Municipality.

The Executive Officer is suggested to maintain the same property with intimation to audit.

Budget -:

Under Section-104 OM Rule 1953 at least two months before the close of year, the Chairperson shall present before the Municipality a complete account of its probable receipts and expenditure for the following financial year together with the actual of the current year and under Section-107 OM Rules 1953, after expiry of 14 days(since presentation before the Municipality) the Municipality shall sanction the estimate and submit forthwith to the State Government. Further Section-109 provides for approval of the budget estimate by the State Government. But on scrutiny of the Budget Estimate the following are noticed. The annual budget estimate for 2019-20 was approved by the Council vide Resolution No 4/8.3.2019 and has been submitted to ADM, Cuttack vide Municipality Letter No.331 dtd. 12.3.2019 in duplicate for recommendation and onward transmission to Govt. in H & U.D. , Odisha for approval. The H & UD Deptt , Bhubaneswar finally approved the budget vide order no

.8733/5.5.2020 which was communicated to This Municipality. .

Preparation of unrealistic Budget Estimate:- As per Rule-56 of Odisha Budget Manual, the estimation of fixed revenue should be based upon the actual demand including arrear and the probabilities of their realization during the year. Odisha Budget Manual read with Section-108(a) of the Odisha Municipal Act, 1950 stipulates that the estimate of income and expenditure should be reasonable and proper. Further as per Rule-56 of Odisha Budget Manual, the estimation of fixed revenue should be based upon the actual demand including arrear and the probabilities of their realization during the year. Odisha Budget Manual read with Section-108(a) of the Odisha Municipal Act, 1950 stipulates that the estimate of income and expenditure should be reasonable and proper. Further, the said rule of the Odisha Budget Manual stipulates that the Budget estimates of revenue and receipts should be based on the existing rates of taxes, duties and fees, etc., and no increase or reduction in such rates and no proposals for abandonment of revenue which have not been sanctioned by Government should be proposed in the estimates. Further Rule 78 of the Odisha Municipal Rules, 1953 states that in preparing the budget, provision shall be made for a minimum closing balance. The amount shall not ordinarily be less than one-sixth of the aggregate on account of establishment and fixed monthly charges for the whole year. But on scrutiny of the Budget Estimate for the year 2017-18 the following budgetary provision and actual of receipt and expenditure are noticed.

Revenue Income Budget Estimates

ULB:- CHOUDWAR MUNICIPALITY BUDGET FOR THE YEAR - 2019-20

Major Account Head	Acc.Code	Revised Estimates for 2019-20	Actual for 2019-20	Budget Estimates for 2018-2019	Revised Budget Estimates
[Indicative Heads]					2018-2019
Rates and Tax Revenue		8738000	107771000	9566500	9585000
Assigned Revenues & Compensation		85600000	78600000	78600000	78600000
Rental Income from Municipal Properties		1311000	1160000	1311000	1311000
Fees & User Charges		979000	417296	734800	784800
Sale & Hire Charges		3281000	2372620	2862000	2862000
Revenue Grants, Contribution and Subsidies		28000000	0	0	0
Income from Investments		2377006	577006	577006	577006
Other Income		1820000	374046	1500000	1500000
Interest Earned		1300000	2364246	3000000	2200000
Total - Revenue Income		133406006	193636214	98151306	97419806

CAPITAL RECEIPT BUDGET ESTIMATES

ULB:- CHOUDWAR MUNICIPALITY

BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2019-20

Capital Receipts						
Major Account Head [Indicative Heads]	Acc.Code	Revised Estimates for 2019-20	Actual for 2019-20	Budget Estimates for 2018-2019	Revised Budget Estimates 2018-2019	Remarks
Grants, Contribution for specific purposes		43167917	36277900	123244600	101801400	
Deposits Received		2430000	2010000	2170000	2470000	
Deposit works		3370447	3489184	1900000	3370447	
Secured Loans				0	0	
Unsecured Loans				0	0	
Total- Capital Receipts		48968364	41777084	127314600	107641847	

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

ULB:- CHOUDWAR MUNICIPALITY BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2019-20

Major Account Head [Indicative Heads]	Revised Estimates for 2018-2019	Actual for 2018-2019	Revised Estimate 2019-20	Actual for 2019-20
Fixed Assets	44538985	34369000	44538985	34369000
Capital Work -in - progress	0		0	0
Loans, Advances and Deposits	1000000	950000	1000000	950000
Other Assets	0			
Miscellaneous Expenditure	0			
Investments -General Fund	0			
Investments -Other Funds	0			
Stocks/Inventory	0			
Total - Capital Expenditure	45538985	35319000	45538985	35319000

Asset & Liability : From the table of assets and liability it is seen that the assets of this Municipality is excess over a tune of Rs .334190000.00 which speaks that the financial position of this Municipality is sound. However the local authority is advised to increase its own revenue through collection of outstanding taxes by taking suitable step. If the financial status of this Municipality would increase it can provide better service to the urban people.

Deviations from OMAR-2012:- As per rule- 5(4) of OMAR-2012 the EO should examine the entries & the closing

balance in the cash book & affix his signature in token of his having done so. The balance in cash book should be certified by EO. But while verifying the cash book, maintained by cashier no such rule is found to be followed.

As per rule-6(5) of OMAR-2012 the bank book should be closed daily, the totals for the end of the day struck & the closing balance should be worked out. But while verifying the bank book it is observed that such rule is not followed. As per rule-10(2) of OMAR-2012 there should be receipt, payment, contra & journal for different types of transaction in the format of ACNT-4,5,6 & 7. But while observing the vouchers it is observed that no such voucher is prepared. Only payment voucher is prepared by the ULB but it is not as per ACNT-5. As per rule-10(3) of OMAR-2012, all the vouchers shall be prepared by the accountant & it should be kept by the accountant. But while checking the vouchers it is observed that some vouchers are not kept by accountant. Those vouchers are kept with cashier although cheque is issued by the accountant. As per rule-10(4)& 14 of OMAR-2012 voucher shall be numbered for each type & shall be distinctly coded for each fund. But while observing the vouchers it is found that different vouchers are not maintained for different types of fund. Rather payment is made from a single bank account irrespective of different types of fund & voucher no is serially made without considering any fund. As per rule-6(6)& 97(3)(a) of OMAR-2012 the bank reconciliation statement should be prepared for each bank account at the end of every month. While observing the BRS it is found that BRS is prepared in e-municipality software only. The print out of BRS is not taken & nobody has certified it. As per rule-4(3) of OMAR-2012 Wherever the Books of Accounts are maintained manually, the Books of Accounts, Registers, Receipts, Bill books and other Accounting Records and Registers shall be affixed with the Seal of the Municipality and each of the pages of the aforesaid records shall be serially numbered. The number of pages of each Book or Register shall be certified in writing on the last page, after actual verification, by the EO or any other person duly authorized by him. While observing the manual records it is observed that this rule is not followed neither by cashier nor Accountant. As per rule-23(1) of OMAR-2012 if a cheque is dishonored, then the party has to make payment in cash on demand only along with the amount of bank charges. But while checking the cheque collection register it is observed that when cheque is bounced the same cheque or a new cheque is again deposited without collection of any charges. As per rule-23(1) of OMAR-2012 if a cheque is dishonored, the dishonored cheque shall be retained by the accountant & it shall not be handed to anyone till the amount is remitted by the party. But while checking it came to our notice that the bounced cheques are handed to respective section rather keeping by the accountant. Also no step is taken by EO for collection of fees for bounced cheques. As per rule-36(4) of OMAR-2012, all payment to employees shall be made through direct transfer to the bank account of employees. But while scrutinizing the vouchers we observed that, some officers are paid their salary through cheque. Some DLR/CLR employees are paid their salary through cash. The reimbursements of telephone bill to officers are paid through cash. As per rule-97(3)(e) of OMAR-2012 the details of closing stock for recording the consumption of stores at the end of each month in Form-ST. While making the audit it is observed that no such stock statement is given by store keeper. As per rule-88 of OMAR-2012 deposits remaining unclaimed for three consecutive financial years after refunds have fallen due shall be lapsed. But while performing the audit it is observed that no lapse deposits are maintained rather they are been paid. **Parking of Municipal Fund in ineligible banks-** During the year under audit it was found that 18 no of Bank Accounts as per the details furnished below have been operated in different schemes in ineligible Banks disobeying Finance Deptt Letter no-15984/ F dt 30.05.2016. The EO is therefore suggested to close the said accounts in the above ineligible Banks as per the instruction of Finance Deptt & compliance reported.

General Irregularities - During the year under audit it would be noticed that all the cash books have been maintained in a very haphazard manner . No OB andCB of all the cash books have been worked out by the Accountant. No reconciliation has been worked out and furnished in all the cash books. Besides above, details of closing balance have not been furnished at the end of each month during the year under audit. Despite of objections raised in last and previous audit reports no effective steps have yet been taken by the local authority in this regard. Hence, the EO is suggested to take effective steps to maintain all the cash books, accounts & registers as per the OMAR -2012 and compliance reported .

PARA: 5 DETAILS OF CLOSING BALANCE AS PER BANK PASS BOOKS & CASH BOOK BANK BALANCE FIGURE

Choudwar Municipality - 418795

S/no	Name of the Bank	A/C No.	Closing Balance Date As on (dd/mm/yyyy)	Closing Balance in Pass Book(In Rs:) (A)	Closing Balance in Bank Date Cash Book (dd/mm/yyyy)	Closing Balance in Bank as mentioned in Cash Book(In Rs:) (B)	Difference(In Rs:)(A-B)	Remarks
1	All Banks		01-04-2019	89550632.10	31-03-2020	89562544.60	-11912.50	Details are furnished below
	GRAND TOTAL			89550632.10		89562544.60	-11912.50	

Reconciliation						
The details of Closing balance as per Pass book and Closing balance as per cash book as on 31.3.2020 were given below.						
Scheme	Name of Bank	A/c number	CB Pass book	CB cash book	DIFFERENCE	REMARKS
NULM	UCO Bank	8490110051498	357601.00	357601.00	0.00	
Biju Juba Bahini	UCO Bank	8490110070239	17760.00	17760.00	0.00	
OAP	AXIX Bank	915010033675657	154229.00	154229.00	0.00	
OAP	HDFC	50100224186698	1299307.00	1299307.00	0.00	
OAP	AXIX Bank	918010099052440	104448.00	104448.00	0.00	
OAP	AXIX Bank	918010049426773	27697.00	27697.00	0.00	
OAP	HDFC	50100220594149	2492203.00	2492203.00	0.00	
OAP	HDFC	50100224186672	572521.00	572521.00	0.00	
PDS	ALLAHABAD	50426930804	1835254.50	1835254.50	0.00	
SBM	ICICI	101301000488	41322877.00	41322877.00	0.00	
SBM	Axis Bank	913010034890163	12747.50	0.00	12747.50	
SJRY			0.00	4353.00	-4353.00	Pass book not tracable
MLALAD	ALLAHBADBA	21220801980	857978.00	857978.00	0.00	

	NK					
MV GRANT	ALLAHBADBA NK	50273933443	130066.75	130066.75	0.00	
MPLAD	ALLAHBADBA NK	21220809480	3258460.00	3258460.00	0.00	
MIS/ACCT SALARY	ALLAHBADBA NK	50166026518	179546.00	179546.00	0.00	
MF	ALLAHBADBA NK	21220788811	1413124.77	1720141.77	-307017.00	
MF	AXIS BANK	913010034890 163	13199.50	13199.50	0.00	
MF	AXIS BANK	915010038912 948	170.00	170.00	0.00	
CULTURAL FUND	BANK OF INDIA	510610110012 182	578475.16	578475.16	0.00	
ABC	CANARA BANK	354010100096 9	301249.00	301249.00	0.00	
ELECTION	CANARA BANK	354010010017 49	180050.00	180050.00	0.00	
CRITICAL GAP	CANARA BANK	354010100512 5	702336.00	702336.00	0.00	
MF	CANARA BANK	354010100132	30240.00	30240.00	0.00	
NRB/WATERB ODIES	HDFC BANK	501001192257 70	4488461.00	4488461.00	0.00	
DEVOLUTION	HDFC BANK	501001810571 40	544695.00	544695.00	0.00	
unnati	HDFC BANK	501002259405 57	11724767.00	11724767.00	0.00	
MF	HDFC BANK	501001920445 03	61963.00	61963.00	0.00	
MF	HDFC BANK	501000941842 62	1672925.00	1672925.00	0.00	
COLLEGE FUND	HDFC BANK	287314500000 20	3937.00	3937.00	0.00	
RD/PT	ICICI BANK	101301000477	1720971.00	1720971.00	0.00	
ARC	ICICI BANK	101305003242	6124.00	6124.00	0.00	
HSY	ICICI BANK	101305003241	599345.00	312635.00	286710.00	
SDP	INDIAN BANK	528703753	223457.00	223457.00	0.00	
R&B	INDIAN BANK	528704496	5987348.00	5987348.00	0.00	
UIDSSMT	INDIAN BANK	6233575629	1329819.00	1329819.00	0.00	
POSTAL	POSTAL	458320	3744.55	3744.55	0.00	
PL DEDUCTION	SBI	10603198990	1004576.00	1004576.00	0.00	
14TH FC	UCO BANK	084901100160	329123.33	329123.33	0.00	

		15				
MF	UCO BANK	084901000099 40	82103.84	82103.84	0.00	
LAND RIGHTS	UCO BANK	084901100702 22	5154.20	5154.20	0.00	
FANNI	ICICI BANK	101301001441	3009205.00	3009205.00	0.00	
	FDR UCO	1593	911373.00	911373.00	0.00	
NFBS	HDFC BANK	501002206680 95		201573	-201573.00	Updated upto 31.3.2019
			89550632.10	89562544.60	-11912.50	

5.1 RECONCILIATION:-

The difference between the cash book balance and that of pass book of the following bank accounts is reconciled which is furnished below.

PARTICUARS	AMOUNT
SJRY - Account not traced /produced to Audit	
Balance as per Cash Book as on 31.3.2019(Cash Book Not Produced to Audit).But as per Last Audit eDAR the balance is taken as such	4353
Deduct unclassified balance	-4353
Balance as per Pass Book as on 31.3.2019 (As Pass Book not traced/produced,the balance is taken as Zero.)	0
SBM – AXIS BANK - A/C NO 913010034890163	
Balance as per Cash Book as on 31.3.2019,as the previous balance is completely left out from SBM Cash Book balance as on 1.4.2019	0.00
Add Reconciliation difference	12747.50
Balance as per Pass Book as on 31.3.2020	12747.50
NFBS – HDFC BANK - A/C NO 50100220668095	
Balance as per Cash Book as on 31.3.2019,as this amount and the account are left away from the fold of Accountants Cash Book	0.00
Add - NFBS Grants etc are deposited in Pass Book,but not reflected in the Accountant's Cash Book	201573.00
Balance as per Pass Book as on 31.3.2013	201573.00
ALLAHBADBANK 21220788811(MF)	
Cheque issued but not encashed	
Cheque No. and date of encashment	
571882/7.4.20	70450.00
57158/16.4.20	10000.00
552051/22.4.20	4943.00

552049/22.4.20	30833.00
552050/24.4.20	9488.00
Cheque deposited but not encashed	
580272 Dt. 30.3.2020	-432731.00
Total differnece	-307017.00
ICICI BANK 101305003241(HSY)	
Grant receipt but not reflected in cash book on 18.3.2020	286710.00

Para. 5.2 Non inclusion of Bank Account in the Accountant Cash Book

It is noticed that HDFC BANK - A/C NO 50100220668095 is in operation in the name of Executive Officer, Municipal Council, Choudwar having credit balance of Rs. 201573.00 as on 02-01-19 (not updated). But the amount lying in this bank account does not find any place in the Accountant cash book maintained in the Municipality.

Hence local authority advised to include the above account in the accountant cash book.

Para: 5.3 OPERATION OF JOINT BANK ACCOUNTS INSTEAD OF SEPARATE ACCOUNT:-

Operation of joint account instead of separate account : During checking of Accountant Cash book with reference to bank pass books it was seen that in one account funds of more than one scheme is deposited and expenditure have been made during the year under audit. Reason needs clarification and regularise the same by opening separate account for separate scheme. Details are given below.

1. NFBS & OAP = ICICI A/C NO.375 OWN SOURCE
2. HSY ,MUNICIPAL ELECTION & CENSUS =CANADA BANK A/C NO
3. MJBV & OWN FUND=ICICI BANK A/C NO.3241
4. PUBLIC TOILET.ABC & RD=CANADA BANK A/C NO.969
5. NRB , WATER BODIES & CREATIVE CAPITAL ASSETS=HDFC A/C NO. 770

PARA 5.3 :- Transaction not made through P/L Account : As per Rule 85(1) of the OM Rules, 1953 all moneys received on account of the Municipality should be remitted intact to the Treasury immediately. But during the year under audit it is seen that funds collected through receipt books are directly deposited in bank account other than the PL account deviating provision. The local authority is suggested to deposit all money received on behalf of Municipality in P.L. account in accordance with the above Municipal Rules.

PARA 5.4:- COMMENTS

As required under Rule 128 of O.M. Rules, 1953, the cash book shall be balanced at the close of every month and signed by the Executive Officer in token of the correctness of every entry made therein. The balance brought out shall be stated both in words and figures and shall be agreed with the balance shown in the pass book of the Municipality. As per Letter No.15847/F., dtd. 27-04-13 of Finance Department, the DDO shall maintain a Register for reconciliation of receipts and disbursements of scheme funds. But no such reconciliation has been done either

at the end of each month or end of the financial year. G.O. No.690/F., XIV-AUD-1/2003,dtd.21-01-2009: speaks that the officers who are statutorily assigned with the task of reconciliation of discrepancies in bank accounts and analyzing closing balance, should perform their statutory responsibilities without leaving the Local Body accounts in a mess giving scope for diversion of Govt. Grants, misutilisation and misappropriation of public funds etc. Also warned the erring officers in charge of accounts need be brought to book. As per

letter No.15847/F, dtd. 27-04-13 of Finance Department, the DDO shall maintain a register of reconciliation of receipts and disbursements of scheme funds. During the course of audit, it was revealed that bank reconciliation statement was not prepared and register of reconciliation was not maintained by the Accountant. The Executive Officer has not exercised any supervision over the duty entrusted to the Accountant for reconciliation of bank pass book with Cash Book. Due to non-reconciliation of bank pass book with Cash Book , the exact difference between the bank pass book and Cash Book could not be ascertained. Further, non-reconciliation of bank pass book with Cash Book may lead to mis-utilization, misappropriation and embezzlement of funds. In response to audit objection statement the local authority has stated steps will be taken for reconciliation. The local authority is once again suggested to prepare and produce the bank reconciliation statement as on 31-03-18 to next audit for verification. It would be seen wrt the Para-4 & Para -5 that there lies a difference of Rs.211806.50 between the balance as per cash book and pass book balance as on 31.03.18 .As per Letter No.15847/F.dtd.27.4.13 of Finance Department,the DDO shall maintain a Register for reconciliation of receipts and disbursements of scheme funds. But no such register of reconciliation was found to have been maintained by the local authority. Nor any reconciliation statement was provided to audit. Hence the discrepancy to the tune of Rs .211806.50 as noted above is held under objection till the reconciliation between the balance as per cash book and the balance as per actual bank position along with the Cash Book position is prepared and produced to Audit. PARA 5.2 Non-maintenance of Flexi Accounts for parking of funds of centrally sponsored schemes : As per letter no.-35425/F,dtd.12.10.2012, all Departments were asked to instruct the implementing agencies which are authorized to keep the Central share & State share or only Central share of the centrally sponsored plan schemes in bank accounts, to keep them in flexi accounts so that higher interest accruals from the scheme funds can be ploughed back to expand the coverage of the scheme without affecting fund flow for the scheme. It is advised to ULB authorities to maintain Flexi account to earn the higher amount of interest. Although audit has advised this suggestion in our previous two reports no step is taken by the finance officer in this regard. PARA 5.3 Regularisation of Dormant Postal Account : Postal account bearing no.458320 has not been operated since 5.10.94. So steps need be taken to regularise the account before close of audit and compliance reported. PARA 5.4 Non maintenance of One Scheme One Account : As per guideline, "Only one account shall be maintained per one scheme funds by the District Authority and implementing Agencies in the State". So steps need be taken to maintain one account by closing the rest account and compliance reported to audit. Details of such cases are given below. A) SBM I) ICICI A/C NO.488 II) AXIS A/C NO.163 B) MUNICIPAL FUND I) ALLAHABAD A/C NO.26518 II) AXIS BANK A/C NO.12948 C) HDFC A/C NO.20 D) HDFC A/C NO.262 E) INDIAN BANK.3753 F) UCO . 9940 G) PDS CASH BOOK

PARA: 6 STOCK POSITION

Choudwar Municipality - 418795

S/no	Material/Item	Opening Balance	Receipt	Issued	Closing Balance As per Audit	As per stock register	Remarks
1	ALL	0	0	0	0.00	0	Details are given below.

Comments

Details of stock position was given below.

S/no	Material/Item	Opening Balance	Receipt	Issued	Closing Balance As per Audit	As per stock register	Remarks
1	Small Fogging Machine	2	0	0	2.00	2	SR Page No-46
2	Spray Machine	3	0	0	3.00	3	SR Page No-45
3	Computer	8	0	0	8.00	8	SR Page No-11
4	Laptop	1	0	0	1.00	1	SBM Section
5	Printer	8	0	0	8.00	8	SR page No.12 and one in SBM section.
6	Xerox and Fax Machine	1	0	0	1.00	1	SR Page-13
7	Videocon LED	1	0	0	1.00	1	SR Page-14
8	Voltas AC	10	0	0	10.00	10	SR Page-19
9	Table Top	2	0	0	2.00	2	SR Page-7
10	Bench	2	0	0	2.00	2	SR Page-6
11	Almirah	40	0	0	40.00	40	SR Page No-5
12	Table	55	0	0	55.00	55	SR Page No-1
13	Table Glass	4	0	0	4.00	4	SR Page No-8
14	Stool	2	0	0	2.00	2	SR Page No-10
15	Chair	123	0	0	123.00	123	SR Page No-3
16	Wall Fan	29	0	0	29.00	29	SR Page No-2012
17	Ceiling Fan	42	0	0	42.00	42	SR Page No-210
18	Wheel Barrow	40	0	0	40.00	40	SR Page No-50
19	Dustbin	51	0	0	51.00	51	SR Page No-21
20	36-40Wt Tube Light	275	0	0	275.00	275	SR Page No.5

21	36-40 wt Tubelight starter	0	0	0	0.00	0	SR Page No-12
22	36-40 Tubelight holder	548	0	0	548.00	548	SR Page No-20
23	30-40wt Tube light choke	0	0	0	0.00	0	SR Page No-32 and 33
24	36-40wt Electronic Choke	133	0	0	133.00	133	SR Page No-35
25	Ordinary Bulb	30	0	0	30.00	30	SR Page NO-42
26	100wt ordinary Holder	87	0	0	87.00	87	SR Page No-44
27	PVC 4mm wire	1505	0	0	1505.00	1505	SR Page No-46
28	8mm PVC wire	300	0	0	300.00	300	SR Page No-51
29	Flexible Wire	946	0	0	946.00	946	SR Page No-56
30	40wt clamp	6	0	0	6.00	6	SR Page No-63
31	70-150 Braket pipe	26	0	0	26.00	26	SR page No-65
32	70-150wt clamp	1	0	0	1.00	1	SR Page No-69
33	150wt sv lamp	49	0	0	49.00	49	SR Page No-79
34	150wt SV-MH choke	36	0	0	36.00	36	SR Page No-80
35	400wt SV Lamp	48	0	0	48.00	48	SR Page No-87
36	400wt SV-MH choke	6	0	0	6.00	6	SR Page No-89
37	150-400 SV Holder	40	0	0	40.00	40	SR Page No-92
38	2.5 amp Finolex wire	2	0	0	2.00	2	SR Page No-94
39	400wt MH Tubuler	48	0	0	48.00	48	SR Page No-97

	Lamp						
40	100 amp kitkat	53	0	0	53.00	53	SR Page No-103
41	200amp kitkat	4	0	0	4.00	4	SR Page No-105
42	10mfd capacitor	52	0	0	52.00	52	SR Page No-112
43	15amp switch	16	0	0	16.00	16	SR Page No-114
44	5 amp switch	37	0	0	37.00	37	SR Page No-116
45	2x24wt T5 lamp	127	0	0	127.00	127	SR Page No-128
46	2x24wt T5 Electronic choke	65	0	0	65.00	65	SR Page No-138
47	Ignetor, Short distance	116	0	0	116.00	116	SR Page No-153
48	36wt CFL lamp	8	0	0	8.00	8	SR Page No-162
49	Bed switch	92	0	0	92.00	92	SR Page No-184
50	32amp DP switch	13	0	0	13.00	13	SR Page No-194
51	G.I Wire	44	0	0	44.00	44	SR Page No-200
52	Analog time for High mxd	4	0	0	4.00	4	SR Page No-208
53	60wt LED fitting	3	0	0	3.00	3	SR Page No-214
54	100wt LED Semi Highmast	0	0	0	0.00	0	SR Page No-220
55	120wt LED flood light fitting	5	0	0	5.00	5	SR Page No-245
56	63 amp MCB	2	0	0	2.00	2	SR Page No-247
57	63amp 4 pole contractor for High mast	2	0	0	2.00	2	SR Page No-262
58	PHH Rice	590.55	6458.92	7049.47	0.00	0	SR Page No-14
59	AAY Rice	195.65	1371.48	1567.13	0.00	0	SR Page

							No-88
60	State Rice	0	900.54	900.54	0.00	0	SR Page No-10
61	PHH Wheat	235.65	5963.56	6199.21	0.00	0	SR Page No-16
62	Kerosine Oil	13.44	168670	168674.17	9.27	9.270	SR Page No-10

As instructed vide the L. No.4225/DLFA Dated 16.05.2015, audit is required to furnish the position of major non-perishable costly materials. It is important to mention here that as these products are durable assets in nature, their balance cannot be zero. On this basis, the position of major non-perishable costly materials, as could be ascertained from the stock registers of the General Store section is furnished above.

PDS

PHH RICE								
Ward No	OB	Receipt	Total	Sale	C.B as per audit	CB as per cash book	Difference	
1	15.16	423.87	439.03	437.13	1.9	1.9	0.00	
2	26.49	561.71	588.2	570.78	17.42	16.86	0.56	
3	0	379.01	379.01	379.01	0	0	0.00	
4	3.54	310.26	313.8	313.4	0.4	0.4	0.00	
5	0	275.56	275.56	275.18	0.38	0.38	0.00	
6	0.97	217.64	218.61	218.54	0.07	0.07	0.00	
7	7.15	287.47	294.62	286.15	8.47	8.47	0.00	
8	16.51	489.11	505.62	505.62	0	0	0.00	
9	2.13	324.11	326.24	323.56	2.68	2.68	0.00	
10	11.06	469.09	480.15	480.15	11.06	11.06	0.00	
11	6.48	230.08	236.56	233.95	2.61	2.61	0.00	
12	0.19	208.98	209.17	208.57	0.6	0.6	0.00	
13	0.1	375.12	375.22	375.12	0.1	0.1	0.00	
14	0.41	232.34	232.75	232.24	0.51	0.51	0.00	
15	0	480.16	480.16	479.54	0.62	0.62	0.00	
16	0.66	276.91	277.57	276.85	0.72	0.72	0.00	
17/18	0	670.68	670.68	670.68	0	0	0.00	
	90.85	6212.1	6302.95	6266.47	47.54	46.98	0.56	

PHH WHEAT

PHH WHEAT								
Ward No	OB	Receipt	Total	Sale	C.B as per audit	CB as per cash book	Difference	
1	10.61	413.37	423.98	422.48	1.5	1.5	0.00	

2	27.08	457.87	484.95	457.81	27.14	26.77	0.37
3	0.37	248.53	248.9	247.73	1.17	0.77	0.40
4	0	319.35	319.35	319.35	0	0	0.00
5	0	246.58	246.58	246.31	0.27	0.27	0.00
6	1.7	313.55	315.25	315.25	0	0	0.00
7	3.68	257.43	261.11	258.66	2.45	2.45	0.00
8	10.76	359.31	370.07	370.07	0	0	0.00
9	0.96	228.41	229.37	227.85	1.52	1.52	0.00
10	22.1	436.27	458.37	458.37	0	0	0.00
11	12.4	241.88	254.28	246.31	7.97	7.97	0.00
12	0	312.42	312.42	311.22	1.2	1.2	0.00
13	0.12	180.65	180.77	180.65	0.12	0.12	0.00
14	0.96	163.03	163.99	163.03	0.96	0.96	0.00
15	0	348.33	348.33	347.93	0.4	0.4	0.00
16	0.44	253.19	253.63	253.05	0.58	0.58	0.00
17/18	1.09	579.67	580.76	580.76	0	0	0.00
TOTAL	92.27	5359.84	5452.11	5406.83	45.28	44.51	0.77

STATE RICE

STATE RICE					
Ward No	OB	Receipt	Total	Sale	C.B audit
1	0.75	45.77	46.52	46.32	0.20
2	3.45	66.9	70.35	69.75	0.60
3	0	63.77	63.77	63.77	0.00
4	0	55.08	55.08	55.08	0.00
5	0	38.4	38.40	38.4	0.00
6	0.65	14.47	15.12	15.12	0.00
7	3.1	31.62	34.72	34.72	0.00
8	2	67.66	69.66	69.66	0.00
9	0	26.07	26.07	26.07	0.00
10	3.75	57.01	60.76	57.9	2.86
11	0.6	26.61	27.21	27.21	0.00
12	0.22	60.81	61.03	60.93	0.10
13	1.53	109.04	110.57	109.07	1.50
14	0.2	41.91	42.11	41.91	0.20
15	0.3	86.88	87.18	87.18	0.00
16	0	52.98	52.98	52.88	0.10
17/18	17.8	162.72	180.52	180.52	0.00
TOTAL	34.35	1007.7	1042.05	1036.49	5.56

AAY RICE

--	--	--	--	--	--

AAY RICE							
Ward No	OB	Receipt	Total	Sale	C.B	cb cash book	Difference
1	0	61.6	61.6	61.6	0	0	0
2	14	88.55	102.55	87.15	15.4	15.4	0
3	0	87.85	87.85	87.85	0	0	0
4	0	84.3	84.3	84.3	0	0	0
5	0	96.25	96.25	96.25	0	0	0
6	0	80.85	80.85	80.85	0	0	0
7	0.7	88.55	89.25	88.55	0.7	0.7	0
8	0.7	100.1	100.8	100.8	0	0	0
9	0	73.15	73.15	73.15	0	0	0
10	0	64.85	64.85	64.85	0	0	0
11	0.44	57.75	58.19	57.84	0.35	0.35	0
12	0	73.15	73.15	73.15	0	0	0
13	0.03	68.6	68.63	68.6	0.03	0.03	0
14	1.4	86.05	87.45	84.65	2.8	2.8	0
15	0	88.9	88.9	88.55	0.35	0.35	0
16	0	88.55	88.55	88.55	0	0	0
17/18	0	75.94	75.94	75.94	0	0	0
	17.27	1364.99	1382.26	1362.63	19.63	19.63	

K.oil

K. OIL							
Ward No	OB	Receipt	Total	Sale	C.B audit	CB cash book	Difference
1	1553.07	9848.685	11401.755	11156.25	245.505	245.505	0.00
2	1556.43	12738.245	14294.675	12542.6	1752.075	1752.075	0
3	910.91	7820.845	8731.755	8262.9	468.855	468.855	0.00
4	832.12	8008.25	8840.37	8840.3	0.07	0	0.07
5	667.2	7092.695	7759.895	7755.205	4.69	4.69	0.00
6	760.554	6274.815	7035.369	6303.82	731.549	731.549	0.00
7	1036.82	6748.54	7785.36	6777.65	1007.71	296	711.71
8	2310.078	11154.072	13464.15	13460.15	4	4	0
9	797.24	7332.475	8129.715	8079.715	50	50	0
10/19	1097.4	10838.45	11935.85	11309	626.85	626.85	0
11	627.93	5507.205	6135.135	5695.552	439.583	439.583	0.00
12	0	6192.215	6192.215	6177.215	15	15	0
13	571.8	5973.89	6545.69	6444.33	101.36	101.36	0.00
14	653.34	5246.43	5899.77	5613.73	286.04	286.04	0.00
15	316.2	9559.855	9876.055	7782.78	2093.275	2093.275	0.00
16	15	6586.12	6601.12	6476.06	125.06	125.06	0.00

17/18	1452.3	15459.62	16911.92	16861.05	50.87	50.87	0.00
-------	--------	----------	----------	----------	-------	-------	------

6.1 -Non – Production of Sale centre records –

The Central Stock register regarding wheat for the period from 4/2016 to 11/2016 and stock register of ward no.6,7,8,9,10&19,11,17&18 were not produced to audit for verification .The Local Authority impressed upon to produce the relevant stock register to next audit further verification.Since this is a matter of utmost significance , attention of higher authority is hereby drawn for non availability of records to audit .

As per Rule 106 of O.G.F.R., an inventory of the dead stock should be maintained in all Government offices in form O.G.F.R. 6 showing the number received, the number disposed of(by transfer, sale, loss, etc.) and the balance in hand for each kind of article.

As per rule 106(iv) of O.G.F.R., articles of dead stock should be verified at least once a year and the result of verification recorded on the inventory. All discrepancies noticed must be proper investigated and brought to account immediately so that the inventory may represent the true account.

Rule 111 of the Odisha General Financial Rules,1959 stipulates for physical verification of all stores by the Head of Office or any other officer as authorised by him twice a year.

As per rule 97 (3) (e) of the OMR,2012, the storekeeper should prepare the stock statement in the form ST. But it was observed that no such record had been maintained.

Rule 97 of the Odisha General Financial Rules, 1959 prescribes that care should be taken not to purchase stores much in advance of actual requirement.

Economy should be observed in the procurement of stocks. It was observed that stocks had been procured before exhaustion of huge stocks. As per Rule 206 of O.G.F.R., subject to any special Rules or order made by Government in this behalf, every cashier, store-keeper and other subordinate who is entrusted with the custody of cash or stores should be required to furnish security, the amount being regulated according to circumstances and to local conditions in each case under the sanction of competent authority and to execute bond setting forth the condition under which Government will hold the security and may ultimately refund or appropriate it.

6.2 .General Comments - During the year under audit it would be noticed that the PDS article stock register have not at all been maintained properly .Neither the month or annual statement has been prepared /maintained in respect of PDS articles during the year under audit .The Executive Officer is therefore suggested to ensure for maintenance of the same and shown to next audit.

PARA: 7 INVESTMENT

Choudwar Municipality - 418795

Sino	Opening	Opening	Amount	Total(In	Amount	Closing	Closing	Closing	Closing	Differenc	Remarks
------	---------	---------	--------	----------	--------	---------	---------	---------	---------	-----------	---------

	Balance of Investment as on (DD MM YYYY)	Balance (In Rs:)	Encashed during the Year under Audit (In Rs:)	Rs:)	Invested during the Year under Audit (In Rs:)	Balance as per (DD MM YYYY) Audit	Balance Audit (In Rs:)	Balance as per (DD MM YYYY) Investment Ledger	Balance Investment Ledger (In Rs:)	e (In Rs:)
1	01-04-2019	853624.00	0.00	853624.00	57749.00	31-03-2020	911373.00	31-03-2020	911373.00	0.00
	GRAND TOTAL	853624.00	0.00	853624.00	57749.00		911373.00		911373.00	0.00

DETAILS OF CB ON INVESTMENT & Comments :						
<p>The position of investment of this Municipality for the year 2019-20 is furnished above. The register of investment need be maintained in Form No-XXVI as per rule-148 of O.M. Rules 1953. The details of F.D.R. as on 31.03.2020 is furnished below –</p>						
FDR No/Date	Name of the Bank	Invested Amount	Rate of interest	Date of maturity	Maturity value	Remarks
552594 / 10.8.2019	UCO Bank, Chdr	911373.00	6.65%	10/8/2020	972072.00	Re-invested on 10.8.19
<p>Section 115 of the Orissa Municipal Act, 1950 provides that the municipality may invest any money not required for immediate expense, either in Govt. Security or in any other form with approval of the State Govt.</p> <p>It is noticed during the course of audit that Rs.911373.00, as detailed above was kept under fixed deposits as on 10.08.2019 / 31.03.2020 without utilisation for public utility and also without the approval of the State Govt.</p> <p>Besides this, Investment Register is not maintained properly. As per Rule-85(8) of Odisha Municipal(Accounts) Rule,2012, a register of investment needs to be maintained in Form-16 of Annexure-II showing all investments belonging to the ULB. The purpose for which each investment is made should be stated in the column provided and the orders of Govt. should be quoted. Further, in sub Rule-9 of the said Rule, it has clearly stated that the Register of Investment should indicate interest due and interest received from time to time so as to ensure that the amounts due are realized on due dates. In respect of interest accrued but not received at the end of the year and accrual entry shall be made in the books of accounts. Though the Local Authority has maintained a Register of Investment, but not properly as per the instruction laid down in the said Rule. Necessary steps need to be taken to maintain the Register properly so as to ascertain any discrepancy in the book of accounts. Besides, it is also suggested that the xerox copy of Fixed Deposit Receipt should also be kept after encasement for verification by the audit. The purpose and source from which the amount is invested may be recorded in future in the investment register. However the local authority stated that the said investment has been made since long from own source.</p>						

PARA: 8 **ADVANCE**

Choudwar Municipality - 2019-2020

S/no	Advance Outstanding as on (DD MM YYYY)	Cashbook Name	Advance Outstanding (In Rs:)	Advance Paid during the Year under Audit(In Rs:)	Total(In Rs:)	Advance adjusted during the Year under Audit(In Rs:)	Advance Outstanding as per (DD MM YYYY) Audit	Advance Outstanding Audit (In Rs:)	Advance Outstanding as per (DD MM YYYY) Cash Book	Advance Outstanding Cash Book(In Rs:)	Difference(In Rs:)	Remarks
1	01-04-2019	ALL	149500 7.18	600500 .00	209550 7.18	399500 .00	31-03-2020	169600 7.18	31-03-2020	131347 5.88	382531 .30	
	GRAND TOTAL		149500 7.18	600500 .00	209550 7.18	399500 .00		169600 7.18		131347 5.88	382531 .30	

Comments :	
RECONCILIATION	
Advance outstanding as on 31.3.20 as per Cash Book	1313475.88
Add- discrepancy pointed out in Audit Report for 10-11 not reconciled yet	382531.3
Advance outstanding as on 31.3.19 as per audit	1696007.18
ADVANCE BREAK UP	
Year	Amount
2000 to 2001	3,67,758.18
01-02	22,714.00
02-03	55,095.00
03-04	42,850.00
04-05	2,11,050.00
05-06	84,195.00
06-07	35,000.00
07-08	15,714.00
08-09	2,500.00
09-10	9,280.00
10-11	13,000.00
11-12	30,000.00
12-13	10,000.00
13-14	2,02,000.00
14-15	10,000.00
15-16	1,50,100.00
16-17	2,000.00

17-18	0
18-19	2,13,751.00
19-20	2,19,000.00
Total	16,96,007.18

Detailed advance adjustment

List of Adv. Paid & adjust. During the year 2019-20

SL.No.	Name of the Advancee.	purpose of Adv.	Adj.Voucher /Dt.	Amount	Year of Advance Payment
1	Tapana Kumar Sahoo,Zamadar	exp.for jalachatra.in the year2019	340/14.8.19	6000	19-20
		free kitchin held in Fanni2019	603/25.10.19	100000	19-20
		Celibration of Republic day 2020.	1033/30.3.20	50000	19-20
2	Chandan Ku.Das,I/C election	Rest shed in different election booth.	92/21.05.19	25000	19-20
		repair of office ambasader no-OR-05 AR-8281	671/3.11.19	7500	
3	S.K.Rajuuddin(J.A)	Celibration of Independence Day,2019-19.	511/1.10.19	50000	19-20
		exp.for L.S.G day.2019	575/15.10.19	20000	19-20
4	Pabitra ku. Choudhary.	REPAIR & maintance of AHHAR center.	257/26.7.19	15000	19-20
		REPAIR & maintance of AHHAR center.	0		0
5	Kamala Mustaquee(Driver)	repair of office ambasader no-OR-05 AR-8281	407/12.9.19	7000	19-20
6	Asit Kumar Das.S.I.	Fist-Aid camp on occassion of kumara purnima2019.	610/6.11.19	10000	19-20
7	Bichitrananda Swain(J.A)	Balijatra Awarness	702/10.12.19	30000	19-20
		Exp.meet, the reveiw meeting.	882/31.1.20	6000	19-20
		covid -19 exp.			
8	Satyabrata	conduct the	0		0

	Pradhan	case149/2018 &150/2018 in odisha high court			
9	Basanti Sahoo.C.O.	exp. For training program on street vender.	927/13.2.20	15000	19-20
		Exp.Angikara Programmer.	990/20.3.20	20000	19-20
10	Debasis Mohapatra J.A	Exp.Vimmabhoi samarthy Sibira2019.	816/13.1.20	20000	19-20
11	Tapana Kumar Sahoo,Zamadar	Republic Day	539/19.7.18	10000	2018-19
12	Chandan Kumar Das,I/C Election	EVM Demo Expenses	1517/26.3.19	5000	18-19
		Election Expenses	1517/26.3.19	3000	18-19
				399500	

List of outstanding advances paid during the year 2019-20 :-

SL NO	NAME OF ADVANCEE	VRNO/DT	AMOUNT	PURPOSE OF ADVANCE
1	Pabitra ku. Choudhary.	945/4.3.20	9000	Repair& maintenance AAHAR CENTRE
2	Bichitrananda Swain(J.A)	1030/30.3.20	200000	covid -19 exp.
3	Satyabrata Pradhan	338/14.8.19	10000	conduct the case149/2018 &150/2018 in odisha high court
	TOTAL		219000	

As per Rule 136 to 140 of OM Rule, 1953 and instructions (December 1985, September 1994 and January 2006) of the Finance Department, advance granted to contractors and individuals for departmental and allied purpose were required to be promptly adjusted within one month from the date of disbursement of advances by submitting detailed accounts and refunding balances, if any. An advance ledger is to be maintained in each ULB recording person wise separate accounts of such advances as the same is to be balanced and signed by the Executive Officer on quarterly basis. The DDO is responsible for any deviation of the same. According to the Govt. instructions (December 1985), each item of outstanding advances as appearing in the cash book of the DDO need to be analysed and got adjusted within one month as delayed in rendering detailed accounts could lead to misappropriation of funds. No sincere steps have been taken by the local authority to adjust the long and old outstanding advances. The present EO is suggested to take a special drive to adjust the above outstanding advances either by way of cash recovery or by voucher adjustment in order to reduce the financial burden of the Municipality. The present EO is suggested to strictly follow the rules 136-140 of O.M.Rules 1953 read with Lr.No-10406/DLFA.Dt-05.09.2014 in case of payment and adjustment of advances henceforth.

Details of Advance paid during the year 2018-19 but remained unadjusted for more than one year as on 31-03-2020

In pursuance of G.O. no. 2221/F , Dt. 08-03-2002 read with letter no. 15179/DLFA , 28-09-13 of Director , Local Fund audit, Odisha , advances remaining outstanding for more than one year is to be treated as loss to the govt. fund . Such unadjusted advances are to be suggested for recovery through surcharge proceedings as per the said G.O.by fixing up responsibility on the sanctioning authority who have sanctioned the advance but failed to adjust the same and the advance payee jointly. Further, in case where the auditee organization does not disclose the information with regard to outstanding advances with supporting vouchers before audit, the officials and personnel in position of the relevant periods are also to be surcharged for total amount of outstanding advances. Subsequently the Govt. in Finance Deptt. In their Circular No. 114/ F. Dt. 5.1.2004 has clearly instructed that advance against Govt. transaction cash book of P.S., ULBs and other organization is also come under surcharge proceedings.

The following are the details of such advances paid during the year 2018-19 as mentioned in the last audit report , but remained unadjusted for more than one year i.e., till 31-03-2020

DETAILS OF ADVANCE PAID DURING THE YEAR 2018-19 ,BUT REMAINING UNADJUSTED FOR MORE THAN ONE YEAR

SI No	Name of the Staff	Voucher No/ Date	Amount	Purpose of Advance
1	S.K.Rajuddin,JA	613/.8.18	50000.00	Celebration of 15th August
	-do-	670/23.8.18	50000.00	Celebration of LSG Day
	-do-	684/30.8.18	50000.00	Celebration of LSG Day
	-do-	852/25.9.18	43751.00	Observation of Independence day
2	Debashis Mohapatra,JA	981/29.10.2018	20000.00	BBSS
Total			213751.00	

For the non adjustment of advance the following officials are found responsible.

Person(s) Responsible for this loss

Sln0	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	SK. Rajuddin	Jr. Asst.	at Choudwar Municipality, Choudwar, District-Cuttack	96876
2	Debasis Mahapatra	Jr. Asst.	at Choudwar Municipality, Choudwar, District-Cuttack	10000

3	Pranakrushna Jena	Executive Officer	At-Darakhapatana,GP, Town-Cuttack, PS- Madhupatana, Dist- Cuttack	106875
---	-------------------	-------------------	--	--------

PARA: 9 GRANTS

Choudwar Municipality - 2019-2020

Sino	Grants Outstanding as on (DD MM YYYY)	Grants Outstanding (In Rs:)	Grants Received during the Year under Audit(In Rs:)	Total(In Rs:)	Grants Spent during the Year under Audit(In Rs:)	Grants unspent as on (DD MM YYYY)	Grants unspent (In Rs:)	Remarks
1	01-04-2019	169650763.50	189921491.00	359572254.50	143020568.00	31-03-2020	216551686.50	Details are given below.
	GRAND TOTAL	169650763.50	189921491.00	359572254.50	143020568.00		216551686.50	

Comments :						
DETAILS OF GRANTS RECEIVED AND UTILISED DURING THE YEAR 2019-20						
The details of receipt and utilization of grants for the year 2019-20 is given below.						
SI No	Head of Accounts	OOPENING BALANCE	RECEIPT	TOTAL	UTILISATION	CLOSING BALANCE
1	Octroi Compensation	0.00	41828000.00	41828000.00	28953771.00	12874229.00
2	Performance based Incentive (PBI)	-3627346.00	0.00	-3627346.00	0.00	-3627346.00
3	Drain	12306.00	0.00	12306.00	0.00	12306.00
4	Construction of Bus Stand	331139.00	0.00	331139.00	0.00	331139.00
5	FDR	743022.00	0.00	743022.00	0.00	743022.00
6	FDR Sanitation & Dewatering	500000.00	0.00	500000.00	0.00	500000.00
7	Untied Fund	235926.00	0.00	235926.00	0.00	235926.00
8	DSFC	26494.00	0.00	26494.00	0.00	26494.00
9	MLALAD	4559029.00	0.00	4559029.00	4371256.00	187773.00
10	MPLAD	2791399.00	0.00	2791399.00	799837.00	1991562.00
11	Las Contruction	48260.00	0.00	48260.00	0.00	48260.00

12	IDSMT	-23122.00	0.00	-23122.00	0.00	-23122.00
13	BSY	9000.00	0.00	9000.00	0.00	9000.00
14	Construction of School Building	146086.00	0.00	146086.00	0.00	146086.00
15	NFBS	180000.00	0.00	180000.00	200000.00	-20000.00
16	Construction of Public Toilet	1415420.00	0.00	1415420.00	0.00	1415420.00
17	UIDSSMT Grant for Water Supply	37731409.00	0.00	37731409.00	0.00	37731409.00
18	Road Development	-3498876.00	0.00	-3498876.00	0.00	-3498876.00
19	State Matching Share on Entry Tax	119000.00	0.00	119000.00	0.00	119000.00
20	SJSRY	0.50	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.50
21	Animal Birth Control	1000000.00	0.00	1000000.00	1000000.00	0.00
22	Motor Vehicle Tax	736083.00	4142000.00	4878083.00	1225400.00	3652683.00
23	Public Toilet	1848000.00	0.00	1848000.00	0.00	1848000.00
24	Maintenance of NRB	847903.00	272000.00	1119903.00	0.00	1119903.00
25	Maintenance of R&B Normal	1393323.00	1720000.00	3113323.00	0.00	3113323.00
26	13th FC Maint. Of Roads & Bridges	1420563.00	0.00	1420563.00	0.00	1420563.00
27	13th FC General Area Basic Grant	1135120.00	0.00	1135120.00	0.00	1135120.00
28	Development Fund, Children Park	79263.00	0.00	79263.00	0.00	79263.00
29	Solid Waste Management	0.00	32419000.00	32419000.00	4123388.00	28295612.00
30	Special development Fund	6408213.00	0.00	6408213.00	0.00	6408213.00
31	SBM	24230130.00	0.00	24230130.00	0.00	24230130.00
32	14th FC General Area Basic Grant	48244490.00	28284000.00	76528490.00	32932151.00	43596339.00
33	4th SFC Creation of Capital Assets	2162933.00	1846000.00	4008933.00	0.00	4008933.00

34	4th SFC Maintenance of Capital Assets	1626383.00	884000.00	2510383.00	0.00	2510383.00
35	MJBY	115000.00	0.00	115000.00	20000.00	95000.00
36	Sitting Fees/TA/DA	132450.00	0.00	132450.00	0.00	132450.00
37	Cons of Water Bodies	2598000.00	0.00	2598000.00	0.00	2598000.00
38	Arrear Pension (LFS/Non LFS)	-5790826.00	19804000.00	14013174.00	14013174.00	0.00
39	NULM	636820.00	244560.00	881380.00	71500.00	809880.00
40	4th SFC Devolution	5224672.00	11643000.00	16867672.00	3223325.00	13644347.00
41	Tourism & Cultural Fund	1236997.00	0.00	1236997.00	826121.00	410876.00
42	Completion of College Hostel Building	-143199.00	0.00	-143199.00	0.00	-143199.00
43	HSY	69420.00	498000.00	567420.00	438000.00	129420.00
44	Election	110530.00	267670.00	378200.00	386608.00	-8408.00
45	NOAP/ODP/M BPY	4666400.00	27169501.00	31835901.00	34762500.00	-2926599.00
46	UNNATI	19292584.00	0.00	19292584.00	10783666.00	8508918.00
47	SDP & Critical Gap Fund	1500758.00	200000.00	1700758.00	1339454.00	361304.00
48	SBM	7169607.00	12003450.00	19173057.00	1804170.00	17368887.00
49	FANI	0.00	3800000.00	3800000.00	1436647.00	2363353.00
50	Covid-19	0.00	2500000.00	2500000.00	200000.00	2300000.00
51	Un-classified grant	0.00	286710.00	286710.00	0.00	286710.00
52	Bhimabhoi	0.00	40000.00	40000.00	40000.00	0.00
53	Kalakar (Cultural Fund)	0.00	69600.00	69600.00	69600.00	0.00
Total		169650763.50	189921491.00	359572254.50	143020568.00	216551686.50

Year wise breakup of Grants:-

The year wise break and scheme wise breakup of unspent grant could not be workout due to inadequate maintenance of grant-in-aid register. Therefore the E.O. is suggested to maintain the grant-in-aid register properly and compliance shown to next audit. However based on the grant position in the last audit report and the grants received by the municipality during 2019-20 and the utilization of grants in 2019-20 the year wise break up of unspent grant upto 31.03.2020 is furnished below.

YEAR	AMOUNT
Up to 2015-16	48568087.50
2016-17	15432230.00
2017-18	11192194.00
2018-19	50450501.00
2019-20	90908674.00
TOTAL	216551686.50

LOW LEVEL OF UTILISATIN OF GRANTS:-

Rule 171(3)(1) of OGFR Vol-I, provides that the grants sanctioned shall be spent within a year from the date of sanction. The unspent balance of the previous year's grant has either to be surrendered to Govt., or it has to be taken into accounts in subsequent year's grant with prior approval of the sanctioning authority. On going through the previous year audit report, it is noticed that on 1st. April '2019, a huge amount of unspent balances of Rs. 169650763.50 was lying with this Municipality under various schemes for years together. Fresh grants were also released without verifying the unspent position of earlier grants. From the above table, it may be seen that the expenditure incurred was only Rs.143020568.00 while total fund available was Rs.359572254.50, the percentage of utilisation of the grants in Municipality is very low in comparison to the total grants available for utilisation under different developmental schemes. The overall utilisation of grants of this ULB for the year 2019-20 is 39.78% only. This indicates that the Govt. money released to this Municipality for developmental works is not being utilized for the intended purposes in time. The delay in implementation of developmental programmes defeats the very purpose of the schemes. The details of head wise receipt and utilisation of grants are furnished below. The less utilisation of funds was mainly due to non preparation of budget estimates, inadequate monitoring and planning etc. The Executive Officer concerned assured to take steps for utilisation of the funds soon. But such assurance cannot bear fruit in the absence of proper monitoring and planning. Hence steps may be taken to utilize the same with approval of the sanctioning authority and proper planning and monitoring may be made for the same and compliance reported to audit

DETAILS OF GRANT RECEIVED DURING 2019-20 :-

Sl. No.	NAME OF THE GRANT	AMOUNT	GO.NO/DT
1	OCTROI COMPENSATION GRANT	10457000.00	7533/16.4.19
		10457000.00	14373/9.8.19
		10457000.00	22452/3.12.19
		10457000.00	675/8.1.20
2	PENSION ARREAR	4951000.00	10052/11.6.19
		4951000.00	17056/19.9.19
		9902000.00	4883/17.2.20
3	MV TAX	1036000.00	11246/29.6.19
		1035000.00	15009/20.8.19
		2071000.00	5339/20.2.20
4	DEVOLUTION	2910000.00	11291/29.6.19
		2911000.00	14716/17.8.19
		5822000.00	2277/29.1.20
5	14TH FC	1979000.00	12174/15.7.19
		13153000.00	7832/23.3.20
		13152000.00	8134/31.3.20

6	CREATION CAPITAL ASSET	923000.00	14348/9.8.19
		923000.00	5379/20.2.20
7	MCC(SWM)	17600000.00	15700/29.8.19
		3205000.00	256/3.1.20
8	MCC(SWM)	3000000.00	15686/29.8.19
		4000000.00	262/3.1.20
9	MCC(SWM)	1500000.00	15706/29.8.19
		3114000.00	268/3.1.2020
10	MAINTENANCE OF CAPITAL ASSET	442000.00	14978/20.8.19
		442000.00	5310/20.2.20
11	NON RESIDENTIAL BUILDING	272000.00	21082/19.1.19
12	ROAD & BRIDGES	1720000.00	21309/21.11.19
13	SAFEI KARMACHARI TRANING	123250.00	ONLINE/4.6.19
14	FANI	800000.00	18766/24.10.19
		3000000.00	22048/28.11.19
15	SANITATION	840000.00	22639/5.12.19
16	SBM	10000000.00	5281/20.2.20
17	SBM	926900.00	Online/22.10.19
18	sbm	113300.00	Online/23.3.2020
19	COVID	2500000.00	7805/21.3.20
20	SDP	200000.00	3647/28.10.19
21	BHIMA BHOI	40000.00	1853/29.10.19
22	ELECTION	25900.00	ONLINE
		129500.00	ONLINE
		93770.00	ONLINE
		18500.00	ONLINE
23	Cultural	69600.00	Online
24	NULM	244560.00	online
25	HSY	498000.00	online
26	UN CLASIFIED	286710.00	online
27	NOAP	27169501.00	online
TOTAL		189921491.00	

DIVERSION OF GRANTS:-

During the course of audit it is observed that a sum of Rs. 4780000.00 was diverted from Accountant cash book to OAP/ODP/NOAP cash book for payment of pensioners vide Vr. No.1026/26.3.2020 which was not yet been recouped. Hence, the EO of the Municipality is requested to recoup the same immediately and compliance reported to audit.

PARA: 10 UTILISATION CERTIFICATE

Choudwar Municipality - 2019-2020

S/no	U.C Outstanding as on (DD MM YYYY)	U.C Outstanding(In Rs:)	U.C due for submission during the period under Audit(In Rs:)	Total(In Rs:)	U.C Submitted during the period under Audit(In Rs:)	U.C needs to be submitted as on outstanding as on (DD MM YYYY)	U.C needs to be submitted as on outstanding (In Rs:)	Remarks
1	01-04-2019	288941324.99	76080972.00	365022296.99	63146146.00	31-03-2020	301876150.99	
	GRAND TOTAL	288941324.99	76080972.00	365022296.99	63146146.00		301876150.99	

--

Comments :

Para : 10.1 :- Non Submission of U.C. in due time :-

As per Rule 170, 171 and 173 of O.G.F.R. Vol-I grants received should be utilized within the same financial year in which it was received and UCs should be submitted by 30th June of the subsequent year to the funding agency as well as Principal Accountant General(A&E) Odisha. The F.D. Letter No.29539/dtd.20-10-14 gives emphasis upon submission of UCs to proper quarter by 30th June of the succeeding year. As timely submission of UC is relative to receipt of subsequent Grants from GOI and cut is imposed on the grant amount accordingly on its non-submission/delay in submission. Hence timely non-submission and huge pendency of submission of utilization certificate is a detrimental factor. Non-submission of U.C. to a tune of Rs.301876150.55 as on 31-03-20 defeats the very purpose of Govt. policy & planning and speaks about the improper management of man power in Municipality level during 2019-20 and lack of supervision of local authority. There-fore the Local authority is suggested to look into the matter personally to clear up all old pending utilization certificates as soon as possible observing all formalities as required under Rule-173 of OGFR Volume-I.

Details of UC submitted during the year 2019-20 is furnished below.

Statement showing details of UC submitted during the year 2019-20					
Sl	Particulars of Grant	GO No/Date of Receipt of Grant	Year of Receipt of Grant	Letter No/Date of Submission of UC	Amount of UC submitted
1	Motor Vehicle Grant	17393/HUD/3.7.2018	2018-19	550/26.6.19	486003.00
2	Maintance of capital assests for Revenue Generation.	19682/29.08.2017	2017-18	550/26.6.19	579139.00
3	Devolution Fund	17969/7.7.18	2018-19	550/26.6.19	2565698.00
4	Compensation for pension Arrear &Basic service	20539/7.9.19	2018-19	1176/30.10.19	1343779.00
5	Compensation for pension Arrear &Basic service	5632/26.02.2018	2018-19	1176/30.10.19	1347000.00
6	Compensation for	17022/30.6.18	2018-19	1176/30.10.19	8842000.00

	pension Arrear & Basic service				
7	Compensation for pension Arrear & Basic service	30069/22.11.18	2018-19	1176/30.10.19	8269492.00
8	Entry tax for Salary & establishment cost	5214//23.02.2018	2018-19	1176/30.10.19	5635527.00
9	Entry tax for Salary & establishment cost	13788/31.05.2018	2018-19	1176/30.10.19	18850000.00
10	Entry tax for Salary & establishment cost	26966/9.10.18	2018-19	1176/30.10.19	9052336.00
11	Const. of community toilet & individual household latrine Swacha Bharata mission	26258/28.09.2018	2018-19	2112/19.10.19	6175172.00
Total .					63146146.00

Year wise breakup of UC due for submission is furnished below.

YEAR	AMOUNT
Upto 2015-16	70725519.99
2016-17	17566133.00
2017-18	59333398.00
2018-19	78170128.00
2019-20	76080972.00
Total	301876150.99

PARA: 11 MISAPPROPRIATION & DEFALCATION

11.1 - MISAPPROPRIATION OF CASH BY SHWOING LESS DEPOSIT THAN THE AMOUNT COLLECTED: - (OSP 92)

On checking of the DCR of Sri Tapan Kumar Sahoo, Jamadar who was entrusted for collection of Trade Licence Fee, it is noticed that against the collection of Rs. 5000.00 towards Licence Fess an amount of Rs. 3000.00 has been deposited leading to less deposit of Rs 2000.00 resulting to misappropriation of cash.

The details of which are furnished below.

--	--	--	--	--	--

SI No.	M.R. No./Date	Amount collected	Amount reflected in DCR	Less shown & deposited	Remarks
1	75107/18.05.2019	2000.00	1000.00	1000.00	DCR P. No.74
2	75128/06.08.2019	3000.00	2000.00	1000.00	DCR P. No. 81
	Total	5000.00	3000.00	2000.00	

The matter was brought to the notice of the Municipal authority but no action has been taken till the close of audit. For the above misappropriation Sri Tapan Kumar Sahoo, Jamadar was found responsible.

However at the time of Special Report spot verification by the V.O , on being communicated with Sri Tapan Kumar Sahoo, Jamadar and on being pointed out about the objection raised by Audit , he admitted this as his own mistake. On being present before the V.O Sri Tapan Kumar Sahoo, Jamadar stated that he has already deposited a sum of Rs 2000.00 vide MR No 79353/Dated 18.06.2021 which has been taken into the Cashiers. Cash Book on dated 18.06.2021 . At the time of spot verification the Money Receipt as well as the Cashier"s Cash Book was verified.

Hence the is hereby settled.

11.2 - MISAPPROPRIATION OF CASH BY EXHIBITING EXCESS AMOUNT THAN ACTUAL PAYMET IN PDS CASH BOOK: - (OSP-28-29)

On checking of payments towards FANI affected beneficiaries it was noticed that here also a sum of Rs. 7500.00 has been excess exhibited in the cash book resulting in misappropriation of Cash to an extent of Rs. 7500.00.

The detail is furnished below.

Ward No,	Total eligible beneficiaries	Absent (Sl. No.)	No. of beneficiaries whom payment made	Rate	Amount Actually paid	Amount shown as paid	Excess shown	
2	577	1 (134)	576	500.00	288000.00	288500.00	500.00	
3	364	2 (4, 3)	362	500.00	181000.00	182000.00	1000.00	
4	367	2 (153, 213)	365	500.00	182500.00	184000.00	1500.00	
6	275	1 (59)	274	500.00	137000.00	137500.00	500.00	
17	741	6 (141, 222, 268, 360, 551, 611)	735	500.00	367500.00	371500.00	4000.00	
Total					2500.00	1156000.00	1163500.00	7500.00

The fact was brought to the notice of Municipal authority through the objection memo but no action has been taken till the close of audit. In response to objection memo local authority replied that the absentee beneficiaries taken their assistance money in late without signature. The reply of the local authority is not acceptable. For the above misappropriation the following officials are found responsible and accomplished the misappropriation.

1. Lochan Kumar Sahoo, NMR, Ward No. 17 Rs. 4000.00
2. Prafulla Kumar Sahoo, Zamadar, Ward No. 6, Rs. 500.00
3. Laxmidhar Nayak, Peon, Ward No. 2 & 3 Rs. 1500.00
4. Pabitra Kumar Mohapatra, Peon, Ward No. 4 Rs.1500.00

It is to mention here that, steps may be taken to effect recovery of Rs. 4000.00 out of Rs. 7500.00 from the Lochan Kumar Sahoo, NMR, Ward No. 17 who misappropriated the money, failing which Sri Jhulendra Kumar Nayak, TC (Supervisor of the PDS Section) under whose supervision disbursement was made is responsible for the loss of Rs. 4000.00 as Locahan Ku. Sahoo is a NMR employee of this Municipality.

But at the time spot verification the Verifying Officer was produced with some key documents pertaining to proof of Payment of the FANI Cyclone Assistance amounts to the beneficiaries, the remarks are put here under and accordingly the responsibility has been revised to the said extent.

Ward No,	Total eligible beneficiaries	Absent (Sl. No.)	No. of beneficiaries whom payment made	Rate	Amount Actually paid	AAmo Amount shown Paid in the Cash B Book	Excess shown	Remarks by the V.O
2	577	0	577	500.00	288000.00	288000.00	0.00	Though there was no acknowledgement of Receipt by the Beneficiary SI No 134 i.e Annapurna Sahoo, But at the time of spot verification the original PDS Card of the above Beneficiary was produced before me .Here in there was acknowledgement of receipt of Rs 500.00 by the Beneficiary. The disbursing

								official clarified that mistakenly the acknowledgment of receipt in the body of the FANI Cyclone assistance Acquittance was not put. But the beneficiary was paid her dues of Rs 500.00 as is evident from the PDS Card details. (Xerox Copy of the PDS Card Acquittance is enclosed)
3	364	1 (SI 4)	363	500.00	181500.00	182000.00	500.00	Though there was no acknowledgement of Receipt by the Beneficiary SI No 03 i.e Dolly Paik, But at the time of spot verification the original PDS Card of the above Beneficiary was produced before me. Here in there was acknowledgement of receipt of

								Rs 500.00 by the Beneficiary. The disbursing official clarified that mistakenly the acknowledgment of receipt in the body of the FANI Cyclone assistance Acquittance was not put. But the beneficiary was paid her dues of Rs 500.00 as is evident from the PDS Card details. (Xerox Copy of the PDS Card Acquittance is enclosed)
4	367	2 (153, 213)	365	500.00	182500.00	183500.00	1000.00	The Audit has wrongly mentioned Rs 184000.00 as amount shown as Expenditure in Cash Book in place of actual amount of Rs 183500.00. It was verified at the time of Spot verification

								.Hence it is accordingly revised.
6	275	0	275	500.00	137500.00	137500.00	0.00	SI 59 beneficiary Kalpana Das was found to have put her LTI in the body of the Acquittance. This has also been certified by the E.O of the Municipality. Hence this was accepted as genuine.
17	741	0	735 and amount of 6 Beneficiaries i.e SI No222,360,551,596,611 and 107 was refunded by the disbursing official to the Cashier.	500.00	367500.00 was disbursed to the Beneficiaries and Rs 3000.00 was refunded by the disbursing official to the Cashier	370500.00	0.00	On spot verification, It was found that Rs 370500.00 was actually booked in the Cash Book in place of Rs 371500.00 as wrongly stated and mentioned by the Audit .Out of Rs 371500.00 , a sum of Rs 367500.00 was disbursed to 735 nos of Beneficiaries and the rest balance of Rs 3000.00 pertaing to

							6 nos Beneficiaries i.e SI No 2 22,360,551 ,596,611 and 107 was refunded by the disbursing official to the Cashier .Hence there is no scope of further refund of Rs 4000.00 as stated by the Audit.
Total					1157000.00	1161500.00	1500.00
					0 was disbursed to the Beneficiaries and Rs 3000.00 was refunded by the disbursing official to the Cashier i.e Total Rs 160000.00		

For the above misappropriation of Rs 1500.00 the following officials are found responsible and accomplished the misappropriation.

1. Laxmidhar Nayak, Peon, Ward No. 3 Rs. 500.00
2. Pabitra Kumar Mohapatra, Peon, Ward No. 4 Rs.1000.00

Total Rs 1500.00

Responsible Person for this paragraph

Sno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Laxmidhar Nayak	Peon	at- Choudwar Municipality,	500

			Choudwar, Dist- Cuttack	
2	Pabitra Kumar Mohapatra,	Peon	at- Choudwar Municipality, Choudwar, Dist- Cuttack	1000

PARA: 12 **LOSS OF STOCK & STORE**

12.1 - Loss of stock (K. Oil) W. No 7, worth Rs.18042.00 by way of showing less stock than actual: OSP 135

On checking the K. Oil sale register w.r.t. stock register of Ward No. 7, it was noticed that 771.71 Ltrs. has been shown less stock than actual leading to loss of stock that extent of Rs.18042.00. The details of loss position for the financial 2019-20 has been worked out with actual stock and stock shown in the stock register of Ward No. 7 and the value of the stock lost has been worked out accordingly at the market rate of Rs. 25.35/Ltr.

The details are furnished below.

Ward No	Opening Balance (Ltrs)	Stock Receipt (Ltrs)	Total Stock (ltrs_	Sales (Ltrs)	C.B as per audit (Ltrs)	CB as per stock register (Ltrs)	Difference	Market Rate	Amount of loss
7	1036.82	6748.54	7785.36	6777.65	1007.71	296	711.71	25.35	18042.00

The fact was brought to the notice of Municipal authority through the objection memo but no action has been taken till the close of audit. In response to objection memo local authority replied that "Actual C.B.was 1007.71 instate of 296 ltrs. The C.B. 1007.71 will be reflected for the year 2020-21 and the same may be dropped". The reply of the local authority is not acceptable. For the above misappropriation Sri Laxmidhar Nayak, Peon is found responsible as he is the in-charge of the distribution and accomplished the misappropriation.

On spot verification Sri Laxmidhar Nayak, Peon admitted this mistake as a book balancing mistake. But as per his version the Kerosine Oil stock has not been misutilized. The balance stock of 1007.71 was physically available in the Stock. By the means of physical verification on Dated 31.03.2020, the E.O, Choudwar Municipality has certified the physical presence of the K.Oil Position of 1007.71 Litre as on 31.03.2020. Again Sri Laxmidhar Nayak, Peon has taken the Opening Balance of K.Oil as on 1.4.2020 as 1311.71 i.e by excess of 304Litre and accordingly receipt and collection of K.Oil during the entire FY year for 2020-21 has been dealt duly by depositing the sale proceeds of K.Oil into the municipal Fund as well as exhausting the whole stock on dated 31.03.2021.

The V.O examined all the corollary records which were made available to me and found myself convincing with the reply of Sri Laxmidhar Nayak, Peon. Sri Jhulendra Nayak, the in charge of this Section clarified that Mr Nayak being a Peon of low Educational qualification has just made the balancing mistake, but he has not misutilized the Physical Kerosine stock. The objected stock of K.Oil was available in the Store inside the Office Premises. And he should be exonerated from such charges like Loss of Stock & Stores.

As per the recommendation and findings of the V.O at the time of Spot verification, this case is hereby settled and hence deleted from the Status of Loss of Stock & Stores This may be considered by the competent Authorities.

12.2 - Loss of Stock (PHH Wheat) worth Rs. by way of showing less stock than actual – (OSP-50)

On checking the PHH Wheat sale register w.r.t. stock register of Ward No. 2 & 3 it was noticed that 0.77 Qtl. has been shown less stock than actual leading to loss of stock that extent of Rs.2020.00. The details of loss position for the financial 2019-20 have been worked out with actual stock and stock shown in the stock register of Ward No. 2 & 3 and the value of the stock lost has been worked out accordingly at the market rate of Rs. 2623.08/qtl.

The details are furnished below

Ward No	Opening Balance (Qtl)	Stock Receipt (Qtl)	Total Stock (Qtl)	Sales (Qtl)	C.B as per audit (Qtl)	CB as per stock register (Qtl)	Difference	Market Rate	Amount of loss
3	0.37	248.53	248.9	247.73	1.17	0.77	0.40	2623.08	2020.00
2	27.08	457.87	484.95	457.81	27.14	26.77	0.37		
TOTAL	27.45	706.4	733.85	705.54	28.31	27.54	0.77		

The fact was brought to the notice of Municipal authority through the objection memo but no action has been taken till the close of audit. In response to objection memo local authority fails to furnish any reply. For the above misappropriation Sri Laxmidhar Nayak, Peon who l/c of the distribution found responsible and accomplished the misappropriation

On spot verification by the V.O , Sri Laxmidhar Nayak, Peon admitted this mistake in Ward No 03 pertaining to PHH Wheat as a book balancing mistake. But as per his version the PHH Wheat stock has not been misutilized. The balance stock of Q 1.17 (In place of Q 0.77 in the books of accounts) was physically available in the Stock. By the means of physical verification on Dated 31.03.2020 ,the E.O,Choudwar Municipality has certified the physical presence of PHH Wheat Position of Q 1.17 Again Sri Laxmidhar Nayak, Peon has taken the Opening Balance of PHH wheat as on 1.4.2020 as Q 1.17 and accordingly the entire FY year for 2020-21 has been dealt duly by depositing the sale proceeds of PHH Wheat into the municipal Fund

Again On spot verification Sri Laxmidhar Nayak, Peon admitted this mistake in Ward No 02 as a book balancing mistake. But as per his version the PHH Wheat stock has not been misutilized. The balance stock of Q 27.14 (In place of Q 26.77 in the books of accounts) was physically available in the Stock. By the means of physical verification on Dated 31.03.2020 ,the E.O,Choudwar Municipality has certified the PHH Wheat Position of Q 27.14 Again Sri Laxmidhar Nayak, Peon has taken the Opening Balance of PHH wheat as on 1.4.2020 as Q 1.17 and accordingly the entire FY year for 2020-21 has been dealt duly by depositing the sale proceeds of PHH Wheat into the municipal Fund .

The V.O examined all the corollary records which were made available to me and found myself convincing with the reply of Sri Laxmidhar Nayak, Peon as well as the documental evidence produced before me .Jhulendra Nayak, the in charge of this Section clarified that Sri Laxmidhar Nayak, being a Peon of low Educational qualification has just made the balancing mistake, but he has not misutilized the Physical PHH Wheat stock .The objected stock of PHH Wheat was available in the Store inside the Office Premises . And he should be exonerated from such charges like Loss of Stock & Stores.

As per the recommendation based on verification by the V.O at the time of Spot verification this para is hereby settled and hence deleted from the Status of Loss of Stock & Stores. This may be considered by the competent Authorities .

12.3 - Loss of Stock (PHH Rice) worth Rs. by way of showing less stock than actual – (OSP-49)

On checking the PHH Rice sale register w.r.t. stock register of Ward No. 2 it was noticed that 0.56 Qtl. has been shown less stock than actual leading to loss of stock that extent of Rs.2083.00. The details of loss position for the

financial 2019-20 have been worked out with actual stock and stock shown in the stock register of Ward No. 2 and the value of the stock lost has been worked out accordingly at the market rate of Rs. 3720.06/qtl.

The details are furnished below

Ward No	Opening Balance (Qtl)	Stock Receipt (Qtl)	Total Stock (Qtl)	Sales (Qtl)	C.B as per audit (Qtl)	CB as per stock register (Qtl)	Difference	Market Rate	Amount of loss
2	26.49	561.71	588.2	570.78	17.42	16.86	0.56	3720.06	2083.00

The fact was brought to the notice of Municipal authority through the objection memo but no action has been taken till the close of audit. For the above misappropriation Sri Laxmidhar Nayak, Peon who l/c of the distribution found responsible and accomplished the misappropriation.

On spot verification Sri Laxmidhar Nayak, Peon was present before the V.O and admitted this mistake in Ward No 02 as a book balancing mistake. But as per his version the PHH Rice stock has not been misutilized. The balance stock of Q 17.42 (In place of Q 16.86 in the books of accounts) was physically available in the Stock. By the means of physical verification on Dated 31.03.2020, the E.O, Choudwar Municipality has certified the PHH Rice Position of Q 17.42. Again Sri Laxmidhar Nayak, Peon has taken the Opening Balance of PHH wheat as on 1.4.2020 as Q 17.42 and accordingly the entire FY year for 2020-21 has been dealt duly by depositing the sale proceeds of PHH Rice into the municipal Fund.

The V.O examined all the corollary records which were made available to me and found myself convincing with the reply of Sri Laxmidhar Nayak, Peon. Jhulendra Nayak, the in charge of this Section clarified that Mr Nayak being a Peon of low Educational qualification has just made the balancing mistake, but he has not misutilized the Physical PHH Wheat stock. The objected stock of PHH Rice was available in the Store inside the Office Premises. And he should be exonerated from such charges like Loss of Stock & Stores.

As per the recommendation of the V.O based upon verification at the time of Spot verification, this para is hereby settled and hence deleted from the Status of Loss of Stock & Stores. This may kindly be considered by the competent Authorities.

12.4 -

PARA: 13 AUDIT OF RECEIPTS

13.1 - ASSESSMENT OF TAXES-

Assessment Register of taxes as required under rule -177 of O.M.rules-1953 was not maintained in this Municipality. The new assessment has not been incorporated properly as required under Rule 178 and 179 of OM Rule 1953. So the exact position of holding tax of the assesses could not be ascertained from records and registers produced by the local authority. Though the Building Plan Register is maintained in accordance with Rule-525 & 575 of O.M. rules-1953, due to non maintenance the position of buildings permitted for new constructions, additions and alternations to the existing building could not be ascertained. Hence the assessment of taxes for all newly constructed buildings was not done in this Municipality. The assessment of holding tax was last done by the valuation department during financial year 2004-05 and published on 08.06.2005. The next assessment was due on 08.06.2010. However no interim assessment was done by the E.O since then. The E.O

is therefore advised to conduct survey of word wise new buildings for assessment and ensure proper maintenance of the above register. For assessment of newly constructed buildings the E.O is advised to take the information from the CESU i.e. the list of consumer of the Municipality area annually, accordingly through the employees of the municipality conduct survey word wise new buildings should be assessed. Suggestions:- 1. Assess Holding Tax on Railway land, Agricultural land and industrial units. 2. Adopt current schedule of rates of PWD for valuation of buildings and general revision of taxes made in every five year as stipulated in the act. 3. Take effective measures for boosting realization of arrears of revenue. 4. Strengthening monitoring mechanism for effective tracing of holdings for enhancing tax base of the Municipality.

13.2 - DCB POSITION:-

The Demand ,Collection & Balance of Taxes :- The taxes on holding and light have been collected by the Council on the annual rental value of the building fixed by the valuation organization of H & UD Deptt. Odisha. Taxes and imposed by the Council U/s 131 of O.M. Act – 1950 at the following rates :- 1. Holding Tax- 10% 2. Light Tax - 5% The Demand, Collection and Balance register is not maintained properly. Basing on the last audit report and Demand, Collection and Balance as supplied by the local authority, the demand, collection and balance for the year 2019-20 is given below-

SL NO	SOURCE OF INCOME	DEMAND			REMISSION			COLLECTION			BALANCE		
		ARREAR	CURRENT	TOTAL	ARREAR	CURRENT	TOTAL	ARREAR	CURRENT	TOTAL	ARREAR	CURRENT	TOTAL
1	Holding Tax	20122470.75	5190422.00	25312892.75				10815173.50	1962161.00	12777334.50	9307297.25	3228261.00	12535558.25
2	Latrine Tax	4998776.75	1268099.50	6266876.25				149495.75	445306.50	594802.25	4849281.00	822793.00	5672074.00
3	Lighting Tax	8754288.00	2819525.00	11573813.00				309314.00	790991.50	1100305.50	8444974.00	2028533.50	10473507.50
4	Water Tax	10484122.00	1959552.75	12443674.75				9262675	199779.75	292406.50	10391495.25	1759773.00	12151268.25
	TOTAL	44359657.50	11237599.25	55597256.75				11366610.00	3398238.75	14764848.75	32993047.50	7839360.50	40832408.00

DCB U/S 290 AND HOUSE RENT

SL NO	SOURCE OF INCOME	DEMAND			COLLECTION			BALANCE		
		ARREAR	CURRENT	TOTAL	ARREAR	CURRENT	TOTAL	ARREAR	CURRENT	TOTAL
1	U/S 290	8278133.00	359566.00	8637699.00	263830.00	4000.00	267830.00	8014303.00	95736.00	8110039.00
2	House Rent	1466665.00	440800.00	1907465.00	258173.00	359227.00	617400.00	1208492.00	182627.00	1391119.00
	TOTAL	9744798.00	800366.00	10545164.00	522003.00	363227.00	885230.00	9222795.00	278363.00	9501158.00

From the above Demand, Collection and Balance position it is found that the collections of taxes were moving around 26.55 % of the demand amount. From the records it is also revealed that the local authority has failed to take appropriate steps for collection of due taxes as they have neither issued any Demand Notice nor initiated any proceeding for issue of Distress Warrant and Certificate cases against the defaulters. For all these the Council failed to provide civic amenities to its dweller due to shortage of fund. Further the council is advised to take

effective steps and to adopt the procedures of rewards and punishment as described under Rule -201(2) of O.M.Rules-1953 in order to enhance the status of collection of taxes.

13.3 - COLLECTION OF HOLDING TAXES ETC-

As is seen from the statistics given above, the local collection as a percentage of effective demand during the year 2019-20 is 17.95 %, which is very poor in comparison to the effective demand. the local authority is advised to take further step in this regard as there is still scope for improvement. However if one looks at the actual demand that includes the litigated amount the collected amount as a percentage of actual demand gives a poor picture of the municipality. The local authority is advised once again to take constructive step to settle the litigation.

Taxes(2019-20)	Demand(2019-20)	Collection(2019-20)	% of Collection 2019-20
Holding Tax	25312892.75	12777334.5	50.4
Latrin Tax	6266876.25	594802.25	9.4
Lighting Tax	11573813	1100305.5	9.5
Water Tax	12443674.75	292406.5	2.3
Total	55597256.75	14764848.75	17.95%

13.4 - POSITION OF DCB

The position of collection of holding, latrine, light and water taxes as per the DCB and the Annual Account register are furnished below-

Taxes	Collecting as per DCB 2019-20	Collection as per Accountant Cash Book 2019-20	Difference
Holding Tax	12777334.5	12777334.5	0
Latrin Tax	594802.25	594802.25	0
Lighting Tax	1100305.5	1100305.5	0
Water Tax	292406.5	292406.5	0
Total	14764848.75	14764848.75	0

13.5 - INITIATION OF LAW SUITS-

No law suits has been initiated during the financial year 2019-20 excepting those mentioned in the above table which related to the previous financial year.

The local authority was asked through preliminary objection memo to explain about the non initiation of law suits against the tax defaulters during the current year. In response to POM the local authority remained silent.

Name of the Company	Litigation of Taxes	Litigation of Taxes u/s 290	Litigation of House Rent Tax	Case No

	Arrear	Current	Arrear	Current	Arrear	Current	
OTM Mill	63,44,203.00	3,85,001.00	26,95,414.00	1,25,948.00	3,69,250.00	21,000.00	5/11
Individual Certificate Case	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Balharpur Industries	6,92,717.00	1,68,111.00	-	-	-	-	732/2016
Libra	-	-	15,223.00	-	26,35,185.00	5,27,037.00	
ICCL	2,24,02,884.00	78,78,499.00	49,49,240.00	2,27,686.00	-	-	99/2016
Veterinary	-	-	-	-	3,33,445.00	14,160.00	

13.6 - ISSUE OF DISTRESS WARRANT

Distress Warrant Register required under Rule – 202 of O.M. Rules 1953 has not been maintained in the Municipality. As a result, the position of Distress warrant issued and amount of tax collected could not be worked out. In response to preliminary objection memo the local authority remained silent. Hence the local authority was suggested to ensure the maintenance of the same and produced to next audit.

13.7 - Collection of new Holding Tax-

The following table depicts the status of Collection of new Holding Tax during the year 2019-20. The date is taken from the new assessment register. The method of assessment and collection of the tax was not intimated to audit. The next audit will check the method of new assesment and collection of the tax.

Sl. No.	Number of the Wards	No of new Buildings Completed	No of New Holding Assessed	Latrin Tax		Water Tax		Light Tax		Holding Tax	
				Demand	Collection	Demand	Collection	Demand	Collection	Demand	Collection
1	19	173	173	58182	58182	24192	24192	151396	151396	2,86,423.00	2,86,423.00

13.8 - Target and achievement of each Tax Collector-

Although target was found to have been fixed with the Tax Collectors for the year 2019-20 no timely review was conducted by the E.O. for which the collection of Holding Tax was not satisfactory. Hence the local authority is advised to make periodical review on their achievement to enhance the collection position of Holding Tax. The details of target and achievement of Tax Collectors are furnished below.

Sl. No.	Name of the Tax	Target for Collection	Achievement	% of Collection
---------	-----------------	-----------------------	-------------	-----------------

	Collector			
1	Rama chandra Pradhan	4,47,281.00	2,20,672.00	49.33
2	Durga Charan Panda	4,55,018.00	2,07,656.00	45.63
3	Pabitra Choudwary	11,90,755.00	6,93,218.00	58.21
4	Laxmidhar Swain	7,97,292.00	5,51,448.00	69.16
5	Sujit Das	4,36,18,781.00	1,33,01,427.00	30.49
	TOTAL	4,65,09,127.00	1,49,74,421.00	

13.9 - Non compliance to rule 201 of OMA regarding boost for collection of tax revenues

The Local authority was found to have not followed section-201 of O.M.Act regarding Reward & Punishment for not achieving target of collection of Taxes. :-

The local authority was found not to have followed Rule-201 scrupulously for which the collection position of Holding Tax was far from satisfactory. Hence the Executive Officer is advised to meticulously follow the provisions contained under Rule-201 of Odisha Municipal Act to increase the collection position of Holding Tax both arrears and current demand so as to develop the fiscal condition of the Municipality.

13.10 - Non collection of GST charges on Tender Paper (OSP 56 & 57)

On checking the cashier cash book with pass book it was seen that the following dates an amount of Rs.1664000.00 has been collected by the sale of tender paper. The detailed are given below.

11.7.2019	773600.00
22.7.2019	4000.00
11.9.19	1200.00
12.9.19	4800.00
13.9.19	16200.00
16.9.19	9000.00
17.9.19	800.00
23.9.19	6000.00
26.9.19	2400.00
27.9.19	2400.00
30.9.19	3600.00
14.10.19	1600.00
8.11.19	96400.00
3.1.20	13000.00
7.1.20	8600.00
8.1.20	2400.00

9.1.20	36400.00
24.2.20	4000.00
27.2.20	678000.00
TOTAL	1664400.00

Whether the tender paper sale with GST and rate of GST or without GST may be intimated to audit. Hence, it is clear that, the amount collected only towards the cost Tender Paper only. Hence, due to non collection of the GST, Govt. sustained loss RS. 299592.00 (Rs. 1664400.00x 18%).

In response to objection memo local authority fails to return the objection memo with due compliance. Hence, Rs. 299592.00 is held under objection till the final compliance by the local authority.

13.11 - Non/Less deduction of Professional Tax from salary (OSP 27 & 49)

As per notification No. of 31801-CTA-43/2010/F Dt. 21.07.2010 of Odisha govt the salary of any employee more than 160001 per annum and less that Rs.300000.00 will eligible to pay professional tax Rs.1500 per annum. It was seen the salary register that Basanti Sahoo, CO's annual salary is more than Rs.160001. Clarification is necessary about non deduction of professional tax Rs.1500.00 from her salary bill.

On further, scrutiny of the salary acquaintance, it was seen that Rs.100.00 less deduction of professional tax from the Salary bill of the Executive officer Sri P.K.Behera. As per Finance Department notification whose salary is more than 300001 will pay professional tax Rs.2500.00 per annum. The annual salary of the Executive Officer is more than 3 lakhs per annum . The deduction of Rs.2400 is made from his salary instead of Rs.2500. Hence clarification was sought through the objection memo but memo was returned without any reply. Hence Rs. 1600.00 needs recovery from the following officials.

1. Sri Prabitra Kumar Behera, E.O., Rs. 100.00
2. Basanti Sahoo, CO, Rs. 1500.00

13.12 - MAINTENACNE OF IMPROPER MONEY RECEIPT BOOK FOR COLLECTION OF HOLDING TAX:-

According to Rule 188 of the Orissa Municipal Act,1953, when tax is paid the Tax Collector shall grant a receipt in Form-I. He shall fill up the form in triplicate by carbon process. Part payments of quarterly taxes shall not be accepted. The original copy of the receipt shall be printed in bold letters "Temporary Receipt" with a note."This should not be considered as final receipt until the final receipt is issued under the signature of the Executive Officer". The duplicate copy may be boldly marked "Final Receipt". The Tax Collector shall issue the temporary receipt (original copy) as soon as he realizes the tax. He shall then submit the tax receipts in duplicate to the EO with the collections. The EO shall conduct checks and sign the duplicate and countersign the triplicate which will form the office copy. The duplicate shall then be issued as the final receipt.

But, in disobedience to the rule provisions it was seen that the receipt book though maintained in triplicate, yet there is no mention of the temporary receipt and final receipt on the body of the original and duplicate copies respectively. Neither the second copy has been signed nor did the third copy countersign by the EO or any designated officer of the NAC. It means that the officer has not conducted necessary checks. Moreover, all the second copies of the receipts of the MR books are still with the office. There is no mention of the note, as pointed out above, on the first copy, which is a must for the public awareness. This alternation of format on the part of the municipality is unconstitutional and illegal.

The Executive office of the municipality is advised to adhere the codal provisions hence forth and compliance reported to audit.

13.13 - Irregularity in revision & Fixation of Holding Tax of IMFA, Choudwar leading to Huge Loss of Municipal Revenue- (osp 57 TO 58)

The File No-IX/TAX/45/2014 pertaining to revised fixation of Holding Tax of IMFA was gone through in details by the previous audit and present audit.

Re assessment of the Holding Tax of IMFA for the year 2015-16 & onwards was made taking into consideration of the Bench Mark Valuation of the Lands under IMFA area of Choudwar Municipality as Rs 75,00,000.00 Per Acre as follows.

Holding Tax	35,01,555.00
Latrine Tax	8,75,389.00
Light Tax	14,00,622.00
Water Tax	21,00,933.00
Total	Rs 7878499.00 Per Annum with effect from 2015-16 Financial Year & onwards

It was further verified that at File Page No-164 ,The then Executive Officer ,Sri Pranakrushna Jena arbitrarily revised the Tax amount of IMFA to a Rs 5771907.00 per annum basing upon inadmissible IPR Rate without any valid reason or justification ,by taking into account the Bench Mark Valuation of the Lands of IMFA as Rs 6000000.00 per Hechter,.(Refer at File Page No-163 & 164).This revision was found to be not processed through the Note Sheet of the concerned File .No council resolution was found to be made effected in this aspect to further revise the Tax amount basing upon IPR Rate as mentioned by the then Executive Officer, Mr Jena. s these lands are purely the own Land of IMFA, it bears no reasoning to revise the ARV as per IPR rate. No such order or resolution to this effect could be made available to Audit justify the revised fixation under IPR Rate.

It is to mention here that Government of Odisha, Revenue & Disaster Management Department vide its Lr. NO. GE(GL)-S-34/2017-391 Dt. 2.12018, clarified regarding the applicability of IPR, 2015 in lease of Government land for setting for setting up industries as follows,

"As per Par a 5.4.1 (b) of IPR, 2015, government land will be alienated and transferred to IDCO for industrial and infrastructure development as per the rate prescribed in the Para i.e. at concessional rate. Hence, project proponent will avail land at concessional price only if the land is allotted through IDCO. In case the project proponents apply for any identified land to the concerned revenue authorities, the same can be forwarded to IDCO for filing of lease for establishment of industries. After the lease is sanctioned in favour of IDCO, the land can be allotted to the project proponent at the concessional rate as prescribed in Para 5.4.1 (b) of IPR, 2015."

From the above it is clear that IPR, 2015 rate is not applicable for fixation of Holding tax by the ULBs.

In the latest development Municipality issued the letter vide Lt.No-3205/Dated 15.11.2019 to the Vice President to deposit of 50 % of the demand money i.e Rs 11543814.00 as per IPR Valuation of Rs 5771907.00 Per Year (For year 2015-16,2016-17,2017 18,2018-19 comes to Rs 23087628.00).The DGM-HR & Administration IMFA was found to have deposited a sum of Rs 10311201.00 vide Ch.No 606480 dated 18.11.2019 towards 50% of Holding Tax demanded and Calculated @ Rs 5771907.00 vide Municipality Letter No-2943/23.07.2018, corrigendum Lt No-3205/15.11.2019,Order Dated 6.11.2019 passed by the Ld. Collector ,Cuttack in Municipal appeal No-99/2016 for the financial years 2015-16,2016-17,2017-18 & 2018-19 by deducting the earlier Holding Tax deposit of Rs 1232613.00 (@410871.00 per annum as per Old rate). That means the Municipality has irregularly accepted the reduction of Holding Tax from Rs 7878499.00 per Annum to Rs 5771907.00 per Annum.

Hence, under the facts stated above, clarification was sought through the objection memo to clarify, why the irregular reduction of the Demand of Tax to the tune of Rs 2106592.00 (Actual Demand @Rs 7878499.00 per Annum - Reduced Demand @ Rs 5771907.00 per Annum) from IMFA will not be treated as Loss of Municipal

Fund leading to fixation of responsibility on the involved Officials. But local authority fails to return the objection memo with compliance.

For the above loss Sri Pranakrushna Jena, Ex- EO is found responsible.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

SIno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Pranakrushna Jena	EO	at. Choudwar Municipality po.Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	2106592

13.14 - Clarification wanting regarding encash of Ch.NO. 580272 Dt. 30.3.020: - (osp 133)

On checking of the accountant cash book w.r.t. pass book it reveals that a sum of Rs. 432731.00 was deposited by Dy. General Manager, OPTCL, Choudwar towards Holding, Latrine, Lighting and Users fee vide Ch. No. 580272 Dt. 30.3.2020 and the same was deposited in the A/c No. 21220788811(MF), Allahabad Bank. Cheque was encashed on 4.4.20, but due to other reasons the same was withdrawn on the same day from the pass book which is loss to the Municipality. Objection memo was issued in this score to intimate whether the same was credited in the pass book in any other day or not.

In response to objection memo local authority fails to return the Memo & furnish any compliance.

Hence, till the final compliance Rs 432731.00 is held under objection.

13.15 - Cheque bounced due to delay in deposit in the bank (OSP-30)

It seen from the deposit register that a cheque Rs.99000/- has collected from M/s. Tarent traders. bearing chno.248980/dt.20.5.2019 of SBI for sale of empty gunny bags . The same cheque deposited in bank and latter it bounced for insufficient fund. What action has been taken after bounce the cheque to intimate audit.

In response to objection memo local authority replied that RS. 99000.00 was recovered Vide Draft No. 855149 Dt. 05.04.2021 which was deposited in Account No. 50426930804 and the same was encashed on 21.4.2021. The same was verified by audit and found correct.

13.16 - INADEQUATE SYSTEM OF COLLECTION HOLDING TAX FROM DEFAULTERS

As per Section 161(1) of the Orissa Municipal Act, 1950 if the sum due on account of any tax is not paid within sixty one days from the date on which it became due, the Executive Officer shall cause to be served on the person liable to pay the same a notice in the prescribed form. If still the dues are not collected, the Municipality is armed with Section 162 of the Act to levy by distress and sale of any movable property belonging to the defaulter wherever found, or of any movable property belonging to any other person which may be found within the holding in respect of which such defaulter is liable to such tax. In spite of all these provisions under Section 161(1), 162,163,164,165 and 166, if the municipality fails to realize the arrear tax by distress and sale, according to

Section 169 the Municipality may at any time apply to the District Collector for the recovery of the whole or any part of any arrear as an arrear of Land Revenue. Again as per Section 170 of the Act, the Municipality instead of proceeding by distress and sale or in case of failure to realize the whole or any part of any tax, the municipality may sue the person liable to pay the same in any court of competent jurisdiction. Further it was found that though the system of penalty was there, yet there was no dictation of breach of tax rule as per Rule 553 of the OM rules 1953.

During audit it is observed that, the Municipality has failed to take appropriate action under various sections of the Orissa Municipal Act, 1950. As a result, arrears to the tune of Rs. 4,08,32,448.50 as detailed below are remaining uncollected for years together. The year wise breakup of outstanding taxes are furnished below.

Year	DEMAND					COLLECTED				BALANCE				
	Holdi ng Tax	Latrin e Tax	Light Tax	Water Tax	Total	Holdi ng Tax	Latrin e Tax	Lighti ng Tax	Water Tax	Holdi ng Tax	Latrin e Tax	Lighti ng Tax	Water Tax	TOTA L
Up to 2010- 11	35,38, 181.5 0	9,21,9 88.25	14,27, 439.2 5	16,32, 856.0 0	75,20, 465.0 0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	35,38, 181.5 0	9,21,9 88.25	14,27, 439.2 5	16,32, 856.0 0	75,20, 465.0 0
2011- 12	4,26,6 93.00	97,84 1.75	1,18,4 53.00	1,38,4 25.75	7,81,4 13.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4,26,6 93.00	97,84 1.75	1,18,4 53.00	1,38,4 25.75	7,81,4 13.50
2012- 13	2,08,1 33.25	53,94 6.00	1,25,9 72.25	1,38,9 81.50	5,27,0 33.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,08,1 33.25	53,94 6.00	1,25,9 72.25	1,38,9 81.50	5,27,0 33.00
2013- 14	1,92,6 97.25	63,62 3.00	91,25 9.75	1,20,3 04.50	4,67,8 84.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1,92,6 97.25	63,62 3.00	91,25 9.75	1,20,3 04.50	4,67,8 84.50
2014- 15	2,92,2 95.50	62,06 9.00	1,00,8 66.00	53,23 0.50	5,08,4 61.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2,92,2 95.50	62,06 9.00	1,00,8 66.00	53,23 0.50	5,08,4 61.00
2015- 16	16,98, 928.0 0	4,11,9 66.50	7,49,2 10.50	14,75, 410.5 0	43,35, 515.5 0	12,46, 577.7 8	2,86,6 44.44	5,64,3 85.19	4,82,1 92.59	4,52,3 50.22	1,25,3 22.06	1,84,8 25.31	9,93,2 17.91	17,55, 715.5 0
2016- 17	44,41, 091.5 0	10,66, 404.0 0	17,53, 042.5 0	24,45, 218.0 0	97,05, 756.0 0	11,54, 612.8 9	2,88,6 53.22	7,69,7 41.93	3,84,8 70.96	32,86, 478.6 1	7,77,7 50.78	9,83,3 00.57	20,60, 347.0 4	71,07, 877.0 0
2017- 18	44,20, 527.7 5	11,11, 020.7 5	17,19, 915.7 5	25,44, 335.0 0	97,95, 799.2 5	12,42, 374.2 2	3,10,5 93.56	8,28,2 49.48	4,14,1 24.74	31,78, 153.5 3	8,00,4 27.19	8,91,6 66.27	21,30, 210.2 6	70,00, 457.2 5
2018- 19	49,03, 963.0 0	12,09, 917.5 0	26,68, 129.0 0	19,35, 360.7 5	1,07,1 7,370. 25	15,08, 261.7 8	3,77,0 65.44	10,05, 507.8 5	5,02,7 53.93	33,95, 701.2 2	8,32,8 52.06	16,62, 621.1 5	14,32, 606.8 2	73,23, 781.2 5
2019- 20	51,90, 422.0 0	12,68, 099.5 0	28,19, 525.0 0	19,59, 552.7 5	1,12,3 7,599. 25	19,62, 161.0 0	4,45,3 06.50	7,90,9 91.50	1,99,7 79.75	32,28, 261.0 0	8,22,7 93.00	20,28, 533.5 0	17,59, 773.0 0	78,39, 360.5 0
Gran d Total	2,53,1 2,932. 75	62,66, 876.2 5	1,15,7 3,813. 00	1,24,4 3,675. 25	5,55,9 7,297. 25	71,13, 987.6 7	17,08, 263.1 7	39,58, 875.9 4	19,83, 721.9 7	1,81,9 8,945. 08	45,58, 613.0 8	76,14, 937.0 6	1,04,5 9,953. 28	4,08,3 2,448. 50

It was asked through the objection memo why the Municipality after issuing demand notice failed to take follow up actions under Section 163, 164,165, 166 and 169 of the O.M. Act, 1953, for realization of the arrears. In response

to objection memo local authority replied "Action will be taken later on as suggested by the Audit". Hence E.O. of the municipality is advised to do the needful immediately as per Rules to improve the financial position of the municipality.

13.17 - TIME BARRED FOR RECOVERY OF DUES:-

As per section 346 of the Odisha Municipal Act, 1950, no distraint shall be made, no suit shall be instituted and no prosecution shall be commenced in respect of any sum due to a municipality under this Act, after the expiration of a period of three years from the date on which distraint might first have been made, a suit might first have been instituted, or prosecution might first have been commenced, as the case may be in respect of such sum

It would seen from the year wise break up of outstanding taxes that the taxes of Rs. 40832449.00 is lying as outstanding balance as on 31.3.2020. Out of which a sum of Rs. 1755716.00 has become barred by limitation (tax outstanding for more than three years & nine months i.e. for the year 2015-16) during the year 2019-20. But not a single demand notice U/s 161 or distress warrant u/s 162, 163 has been issued during the year 2019-20 Municipal authorities which resulted loss to the Municipal Fund. For the above loss the following officials are found responsible.

The year wise break up of outstanding taxes is furnished below.

Year	TOTAL
Up to 2010-11	75,20,465.00
2011-12	7,81,413.50
2012-13	5,27,033.00
2013-14	4,67,884.50
2014-15	5,08,461.00
2015-16	17,55,715.50
2016-17	71,07,877.00
2017-18	70,00,457.25
2018-19	73,23,781.25
2019-20	78,39,360.50
Grand Total	4,08,32,448.50

Responsible Person for this paragraph

SIno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Pabitra kumar Behera	EO	at. Choudwar Municipality Po. Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	877858
2	Mahadev Prasad	Sr Asst.	at Choudwar	877858

	Jena		Municipality. Choudwar, Cuttack	

PARA: 14 AUDIT OF EXPENDITURE
14.1 - Excess expenditure on fuel consumption (OSP 92-93)

As per Notification no.34085/29.9.2012 of Finance Department a non AC Ambassador car consume one ltr of diesel at 14 kmpl.

On checking the vehicle log book of ambassador car bearing No.OR-05-AR-8281 with purchase bill of diesel it was observed that the Municipal sustained loss to a tune of Rs. 33428.00 by showing less Kilometer per Ltr. by violating the above guideline. It is to mention here that in the log book of the vehicle POL consumption shown 10km/Ltr resulted loss calculated below. This needs clarification.

Ambassador car -OR-05-AR-8281							
Month	Distance covered (in km)	Consumption of POL as per log book (in Ltrs.)	Consumption of POL as per audit (in Ltrs.)	Excess consumption shown in log book	Rate of POL	Money value of POL	vrno/dt
March	1360	136	97	39	71.25	2778.75	23/30.3.19
April	1120	112	80	32	70.82	2266.24	88/18.5.19
May	270	27	19	8	70.82	566.56	88/18.5.19
June	690	69	49	20	69.32	1386.4	134/12.6.19
July	940	94	67	27	71.2	1922.4	322/8.8.19
August	940	94	67	27	70.44	1901.88	404/4,9,19
September	1190	119	85	34	71.2	2420.8	563/14.10.19
October	1170	117	83	34	70.82	2407.88	638/13.11.19
November	1540	154	110	44	70.82	3116.08	727/16.12.19
December	2210	221	157	64	73	4672	818/14.1.20
January	1970	197	141	56	71.65	4012.4	923/12.2.20
February	3020	302	216	86	69.49	5976.14	953/7.3.20
	16420	1642		1642		33427.53	

In response to objection memo local authority replied that a Non-AC Ambassador Car consumed 1 liter diesel for 14 Kms. But the Ambassador car bearing No. OR-05-AR-8281 which is used in this municipality is a AC car. So the car consumed fuel 1 liter diesel for 10 Kms. We have also asked to the dealer regarding the fuel efficiency of the said car and he told that AC car will give you 10 Kms. per liter diesel. From the previous practice that car was consumed 1 ltr diesel for 10 kms."

It is to mention here that this Ambassador car model is Grand 1500 model vehicle. As per Hindustan Motors Ambassador Grand 1500 version it is Non-AC vehicle. Besides this as per Lr. No. 34085/F Dt 29.9.2012, Block/ Tahasils/ other field officers / District or Range level officer admissible Non-AC vehicle. Executive Office is also comes under this category. Besides this, there is no certificate from the MVI regarding reasons for less shown of mileage as he is the competent authority not the dealer in verbal. Hence, the reply furnished by the local

authority is not acceptable. Hence objection stands and for the same the following Official(s) found responsible.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

S/no	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	S.K.KAMAL MUSTAFA	DRIVER	AT. CHOUDWAR MUNICIPALITY PO. CHOUDWAR DIST. CUTTACK	33428

14.2 - In admissible payment towards Conveyance allowance (OSP 49)

As per Lr. No. UPA-C-SJ-52/2011/ 30271/hud Dtd.11-11-2011, Rs. 500.00 expenditure towards conveyance & TA & DA for official tour (out of Head quarter) is allowed to community organiser which will be met from UCDN(fund) component of SJRY.

On scrutiny of the staff salary acquaintance, it was seen that Basanati Sahoo, CO, was on leave from 1.2.19 to 31.7.19 and her leave salary drawn on august vide Vr. No. 402/07-09-2019. On further, scrutiny it seen that conveyance allowance @ 500/- p.m is paid the leave period of six month in toto Rs.3000.00 with her arrear salary by violating the above Govt. order. Hence, objection memo was issued to clarify why the paid conveyance allowance for the leave period of Rs.3000.00 shall not be treated as inadmissible and suggested for recovery.

In response to objection memo local authority replied that RS. 3000.00 was recovered vide MR No. 79336 Dt. 19.05.2021 and the same was accounted for in the Cashiers Cash Book on 19.05.2021.

14.3 - Expenditure towards FANI on out of PDS money in anticipation of receipt of grant (SOP 49)

On scrutiny of the PDS cash book with pass book, it was seen that Rs.2500000.00 spent for beneficiaries of cyclonic storm FANI affected people from PDS fund. The same fund has not been recouped till yet for which clarification was sought through the objection memo.

The local authority has failed to compliance the memo. So the diverted amount was kept under objection till its recoupmnt and local authority is advised to take effective steps in this regard and compliance reported to audit.

14.4 - Excess payment of Salary (OSP 42)

On checking of the pay acquaintance roll and service book along with the personal file of Sri Jhulendra Kumar Nayak, TC it was revealed that a sum of Rs.302388.00was paid to Sri Nayak towards salary paid to him during 2019-20 as per the interim order of the Hon'ble High Court dt 07.09.2012 and its subsequent extension till 28.01.2016 received by this municipality vide memo No.3305(2) , dt 25.1.16 of the High Court of Odisha. In above context, it is to be mentioned that the Govt in H&UD Dept, Odisha directed to the E.O Choudwar Municipality to revoke the regularisation of service of Sri Nayak vide L.No.21777/HUD,dt.3.8.12 on the ground that before regularisation of service no approval was obtained from Govt in H&UD Deptt and concurrence from the FD. Accordingly, EO revoked the service regularisation order of Sri Nayak vide O.O.No.1823/7.8.12. After this Sri Nayak filed a writ petition vide WP(C) No.15784/12 before the Hon'ble High Court challenging the order of both the govt and revoke order of EO.

In view of the non-existence of both the impugned orders dt.3.8.12 of Govt. in H&UD deptt & dt 7.8.12 of E.O,

Choudwar Municipality and as per the interim order of Hon'ble High Court the salary of Sri Nayak, TC should be drawn as on 07.9.2012 in the following scale of pay.

Pay – 6680.00 GP- 1650.00 DA – 5998 (@72% of pay+GP) HRA- 417.00 = Total Rs 14745.00

But in contravention of above interim Hon'ble HC order, Sri Nayak, TC was paid at the following rate after sanction of increment till 01.06.2016

PAY- 8060.00

GP- 1900.00

DA- 14741.00(148%)

HRA- 498.00

TOTAL-25199

This aspect has been pointed out since last Audits. Hence clarification was sought for seeking why no tangible steps are being taken in this regard till date. Any latest development on the matter to be clarified to Audit.

The local authority replied that the matter was under sub-judice. After court order necessary steps will be taken in this regard.. So the para kept on objection for the next audit.

14.5 - Non Production of vouchers Biju Juba Bahini (OSP 47 to 48)

On checking of the Biju juba bahini cash book with pass book it was seen that an amount of Rs.620000.00 was spent for distribution of sports articles to different clubs at Municipality area without supporting vouchers. Hence, objection memo was issued to produce the following vouchers.

VR no/date	Cheque no/dt	Amount
5/28.6.2019	000021/28.6.19	200000.00
6/1.7.19	000022/1.7.19	170000.00
7/2.7.19	000023/2.7.19	100000.00
8/5.7.19	000024/5.7.19	150000.00

The local authority has failed to produce the above vouchers before audit for verification. So total expenditure of Rs. 620000.00 is kept on objection and local authority is advised to produce the same before next audit.

14.6 - PAYMENT WITHOUT CERTIFICATION: - (OSP -16)

As per Municipal Rules Rule 96(1), all claims which are preferred and accepted shall be paid at the earliest possible date. Every bill presented shall be entered in the register of bills in Form No. VII. At the close of the year the unpaid amounts shall be shown in column 'Balance' and the reason for non-payment noted in the remark's column of the register. The balance outstanding on the 31st March shall be carried forward in detail to the register of bills for the next year.

On checking of the cash book w.r.t. vouchers it reveals that a sum Rs. 61000.00 was shown as expenditure towards special cleaning of weeds from 16 bathing ghats on occasion of Kartikapurnima in different works of the municipality from 14.11.2018 to 20.11.2018 vide Voucher No 21/2.4.2019. For the said expenditure supporting papers as well as clarification wanting on the following points.

1. Council resolution for such expenditure.
2. Order for work
3. Reasons for delay in payment particularly labour-oriented work i.e. after 4 & half months
4. No signature by the paying officer in the muster roll.
5. No certificate was given by any authority / person except Sanitary Inspector who received the payment {except work No.13 (Rs. 9000.00)}
6. Why the work was executed departmentally without inviting tender?
7. There are no photographs in supports of such expenditure.

Payment cannot be admitted in audit without any certification of the competent Authorities as to whether this was actually made in public interest as per the Bills submitted. Besides this, in support of such payment register maintained as per Rule Rule 96(1) was not produced before audit.

The reply of the local authority is also not correct as the work was done on 14.11.2018 to 20.11.2018 and Sri Pranakrushna Jena, EO relieved on 30.11.2018. During this period there are 13 payments (Vr No. 654 to 667) were made after that Dr. Ananda Rout, OAS joined as EO on 31.11.2018 and remain as EO till 14.02.2019. During this time the bill was also not produced for payment although this is a Muster Roll payment. After issue of objection memo local authority fails to produce the photographs as well as work order for execution of this work. Hence payment without any certification regarding execution of work and with out approval by the administrator is not admitted in audit & Rs. 52000.00 (Rs. 61000.00 – 9000.00) is treated as inadmissible in audit and for the same the following official(s) are found responsible.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

S/no	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Pranakrushna Jena	EO	at. Choudwar Municipality po.Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	52000

14.7 - DELAY IN CLAIM AND PAYMENT TO EASTERN MEDIA: - (OSP 16)

As per Municipal Rules Rule 96(1), all claims which are preferred and accepted shall be paid at the earliest possible date. Every bill presented shall be entered in the register of bills in Form No. VII. At the close of the year the unpaid amounts shall be shown in column 'Balance' and the reason for non-payment noted in the remark's column of the register. The balance outstanding on the 31st March shall be carried forward in detail to the register of bills for the next year.

On checking of the accountant cash book w.r.t. vouchers it reveals that a sum of the Rs. 32124.00 was shown as payment to the Eastern Media Limited towards advertisement bill for publication. On checking of the same it reveals that the advertisement was published during 2/2016, the claim bill of the Eastern Media was received by the Municipality on 3/2018 and the payment was released during 4/2019. The details are furnished below. Hence it needs clarification why the claim as well as the payment was made after lapses of two years and 2months. Besides this, documentary evidence my kindly be produced before audit that the payment was not released previously.

ORDER NO.	DATE	DATE OF PUBLICATION	DUE DATE FOR PAYMENT	DATE OF BILL RECEIPT	VOUCHER No. & DATE OF PAYMENT	AMOUNT
443	19.2.2016	21.2.2016	6.4.2016	17.3.18	35/6.4.19	12155.00
300	3.2.16	4.2.16	20.3.2016	17.3.2018		6946.00
276	9.2.2016	10.2.2016	26.3.2016	26.3.2016		13023.00
TOTAL						32124.00

The local authority has failed to furnish compliance of the audit objection. So the para is kept on objection for the next audit.

14.8 - LOSS DUE TO NEGLIGENCE IN DUTY – (osp-17)

On checking of the accountant cash book with reference to the vouchers it reveals that a sum of Rs. 59,535.00 was shown as expenditure towards payment to The Samaj for advertisement bill for 2019-20 vide Vr. No. 939 Dt. 2.3.2020. Out of the same, Rs. 28500.00 was shown as expenditure towards advertisement for the Tender call notice No. 2116 dt. 21.10.2019 regarding regular sweeping of public roads, streets, public places, bus stand, daily market, cleaning of solid waste and disposal of garbage and spreading of disinfectants of the Municipality through off-line process on 22.10.2019 **without intimating to the office of Administrator.**

To carry out the Govt instruction laid down in order No. 13451 Dt. 31.7.2019, for "Decentralised" processing facility (e-tender), the said tender was cancelled and corrigendum was issued on 5.10.2019 vide order No. 2930 DT. 4.10.2019 and for the same Rs. 4700.00 was shown as expenditure. Hence, for the above activity clarification wanted on the following points.

1. Why the tender was floated without a memo to the office of the Administrator?
2. Why the tender was not put to e-tender.
3. Why the municipality shall bear the advertisement cost due to negligence of the staff.
4. Why the amount spent for advertisement and cancellation charges shall be treated as loss to the organisation and the same shall not be suggested for recovery from the person(s) found responsible for this

In response to objection memo local authority replied that, the Executive Officer of that period instructed to float the off line tender immediately as the time period of both the agencies working in the sanitation work to be completed within a short period and have no knowledge of e-tender process. Due to rapid process of tender file such mistake is done and the Executive officer and Administrator have not emphasize the matter at the time of approval. As per complain of the other aspirants those willing to participate in the tender process, the Administrator was ordered to cancelled the off line tender. Besides this, due to lack of knowledge of Jr Asst. and over come the importance of tender process, such loss has occurred."

The reply of the local authority is not admissible. Without proper knowledge, how the e-tender was published immediately after cancellation of the off line tender? Hence, the reply of the local authority was after thought and objection stands.

Hence Rs. 33200.00 (28500.00 + 4700.00) needs recovery from the following officials.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

--	--	--	--

Sno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Satyabrata Mantri	EO	at.Sambalpur Municipal corporation Po. Sambalpur Dist.Cuttack	16600
2	Bichitranananda Swain	JA	at. Choudwar Municipality po. Choudwar Dist. Cuttack.	16600

14.9 - CLARIFICATION WANTING REGRING PURCHASE OF TRI-CYCLE FROM THE COMPOSITION DEALER BY PAYMENT GST TAX: - OSP 17

A **Composition Dealer** is not allowed to avail input **tax** credit of **GST** on purchases. A **Composition Dealer** has to issue Bill of Supply. the **composition dealer** cannot collect tax paid by him on outward supplies from his customers, the registered person making **purchases** from a taxable person paying tax under the **composition scheme** cannot avail credit.

But on checking of the accountant cash book w.r.t. vouchers it reveals that a sum of Rs. 209376.00 was shown as expenditure towards purchase of 12 Nos. of Tri-cycle from Jagannath Engineering Works (GSTN No. 21CBEPS3344C1Z4) against Bill No. 53 Dt 19.12.2019 . vide Vr. No. 866 Dt. 20.1.20. Out of same Rs. 15960.00 paid towards CGST & Rs. 15960.00 towards OGST @9% each. On cross verification of the GSTN No., it reveals that the dealer is a **Composition dealer**. A Composition Dealer has to issue [Bill of Supply](#). **They cannot issue a tax invoice**. This is because the tax has to be paid by the dealer out of pocket. **A Composition Dealer is not allowed to recover the GST from the customers.**

Hence, objection memo was issued to clarify, why the purchase of the goods shall not be treated as inadmissible and the cost of the Taxes paid towards CGST & OGST shall not be treated as loss to the Municipality.

In response to objection memo local authority replied " Jagannath Engineering works quoted the lowest rate for supply of Tricycle to this Municipality. We don't have the knowledge on composition dealer. M/s Jagannath Engineering has supplied 12 Nos. of Tricycle as per quoted rate including GST and payment is made accordingly. Please suggest, how to recover the GST amount paid to the supplier or what amount to be recovered from the supplier if possible at our level. Hence, the para may kindly be dropped"

From the above reply it is clear that the purchase of goods were made without verifying the GST No. of the supplier. Besides this no action has also been taken by the Municipality authority to recover the amount from the concerned supplier by making a correspondence with him. This is a direct loss of fund of this municipality as the GST paid by this municipality was not deposited in proper head of account.. The reply is not acceptable.

Attention of the higher authority was drawn here by for further action against the concerned dealer. Till then, Rs. 209376.00 is held under objection out of which Rs. 31920.00 is suggested for recovery from the following officials for making payment without verification.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

Sno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Pabitra kumar Behera	EO	at. Choudwar Municipality Po. Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	15960

2	Bichitranananda Swain	JA	at. Choudwar Municipality po. Choudwar Dist. Cuttack.	15960

14.10 - CLARIFICATION WANTING REGARDING EXPENDITURE TOWARDS POL FOR ELECTION WORK: - (OSP 18)

As per instruction of Office of the Collector & District Election office Vehicle No. OD05F0913 vehicle was attached to Deputy Collector (Election), Collectorate, Cuttack for election work. ***The consumption of POL will be borne by the District Election Officer after observing all formalities.***

On checking of the voucher, it reveals that a sum of Rs. 15708.00 was shown as expenditure towards cost of POL for the above vehicle. The details are furnished below.

DATE	QTY.	AMOUNT	Voucher No. & Date
7.3.19	20	1433.00	42/ 17.4.2019
23.3.19	20	1433.20	
27.3.19	30	2146.20	
2.4.19	20	1421.20	
6.4.19	20	1433.20	
10.4.19	20	1421.60	
13.4.19	20	1423.40	
16.4.19	20	1426.00	
19.4.19	20	1426.00	
22.4.19	20	1429.20	
24.4.19	10	714.60	
Total		15707.60	

Hence objection memo was issued to clarify, whether the amount was recouped from the District election Officer or not. Besides this, what steps were taken by the Municipality to recoup the said expenditure. Besides this, local authority asked through the objection to produce the log book of the said vehicle before audit for verification of genuineness of the expenditure.

In response to objection memo local authority neither furnished any reply nor produced the log book of that vehicle. Hence, till the production of the log book and recoupment of the above payment, Rs. 15707.00 is held under objection.

14.11 - PAYMENT TO SIDHINATH MANTRY, AMIN BY MAKING IRREGULAR APPOINTMENT: - (OSP 10-21)

On checking of the pay acquaintance roll w.r.t accountant cash book it reveals that, a sum of Rs. 144272.00 was paid towards salary to Sidhinath Mantry, Amin by making irregular appointment. It is to mention here that an inquiry was made by the Asst. Collector as per order No. 3180 DT. 11.11.2019 of the Administrator, Choudwar Municipality. As per inspection report, the following Irregularities were committed in appointment of Amin by the Ex-Executive Officer of this municipality are furnished below.

1. Appointment of the Amin was mad as per Notification No. 16030 Dt. 4.5.2013, where 80 number of posts was sanctioned in favour of Choudwar Municipality by Govt. of Odisha, H & UD Department including one

- post of Amin. But, subsequently in another order No. 14986 Dt. 11.6.2015, all the eighty-post sanctioned vide Notification No. 16030 Dt. 4.5.2013 were abolished by Govt.
2. On 29.7.2017, the Ex-Executive Officer, placed the Notification No. 16030 Dt. 4.5.2013 before the committee for appointment of one Amin and a 3-members sub-committee was formed vide resolution no. 5(NA) on the said date to select Amin. On gone through the proceedings of committee held on 29.7.2017 it is observed that after closure of the proceedings the chairman has put his signature, but on the next page the proceeding No. 5(NA) was added without signature of the Chairman.
 3. In the screening committee of applications received, four members had put their signature on 18.6.2018. The Dealing Asst., the JE, Chairman and Counsellor of Ward No.2. The signature of Executive Officer was erased.
 4. During inquiry of the Asst. Collector, Ex-Executive Officer, Sri Prana Krushna Jena stated that, no such advertisement was made during his incumbency in Choudwar Municipality. No additional Resolution NO. 5(NA) Dt. 29.7.2017 was made for appointment of Amin.
 5. The Ex-Chairman Sri Kailash Ch. Prusty has admitted that, he has put his signature without going through the content.
 6. The signature of the Ex-JE Sri Kailash Ch. Sahoo and the Ex-Counsellor, Word No. 2 have been forged to get the selection of Amin approved.
 7. On 1.3.2019 appointment order was issued to Sri Sidhinath Mantry, S/o Satyabrata Mantry (Ex-Executive Officer) by approved by Administrator. In the file, it is seen that, it has been forged to get it approved.
 8. Letter copy issued to The Joint Secretary; H & UD department vide Lr. No. 531 & its memo 532 to the Collector, Cuttack & PD-DUDA, Cuttack regarding joining of the Amin. But on cross verification of the issued register, it is ascertained that the said letter No. & its memo No. are shown as Tax notice.
 9. Appointment order of Amin was issued vide Lr. No. 457 Dt. 23.2.2019 but the copy of the same was given to Bill clerk during 5/2019.

Considering the above facts, inquiry officer concluded that Sri Satyabrata Mantri, Ex- Executive Officer, Choudhwar Municipality had indulged himself in unlawful, illegal and malafied activities in appointment of Amin the Municipality by way of

1. Making advertisement in back date
2. Adding false resolution on Dt. 29.7.2017
3. Consisting false committee and forging signature of Ex-Administrator, Ex-JE, Ex-Counsellor to make illegal appointment regular.
4. Appointment order issued against abolished post. .

Hence, objection memo issued to clarify, why the expenditure made towards salary to a tune of Rs.144272.00 against illegally appointed Amin the details of which are given below shall not be suggested for recovery from the official(s) found responsible for this.

MONTH	PAY	GP	DP	TOTAL	Vr No. & Date
Mar-19	5200.00	1900.00	10934.00	18034.00	59/13.5.19
Apr-19	5200.00	1900.00	10934.00	18034.00	
May-19	5200.00	1900.00	10934.00	18034.00	110/1.6.19
Jun-19	5200.00	1900.00	10934.00	18034.00	198/5.7.19
Jul-19	5200.00	1900.00	10934.00	18034.00	263/2.8.19
Aug-19	5200.00	1900.00	10934.00	18034.00	400/7.9.2019
Sep-19	5200.00	1900.00	10934.00	18034.00	502/1.10.2019
Oct-19	5200.00	1900.00	10934.00	18034.00	614/8.11.2019
Total	41600.00	15200.00	87472.00	144272.00	

In response to objection memo local authority replied that "The matter is under sub judice vide WPC case No.25623/2019. After finalisation of the case, steps will be taken by the municipality authority regarding the

recovery of the paid salary".

The reply of the local authority is fails to settle the objection as the said case was filed by Sri Sidhinath Mantry, not by the the Sri Satyabrata Mantri, Ex- Executive Officer. As it is proved that the appointment was made by adopting unlawful, illegal and malafied activities by Sri Satyabrata Mantri, Ex-EO. For the above payment Sri SatyabrataMantry, Ex-EO found responsible and the amount needs recovery from him.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

SIno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Satyabrata Mantri	EO	at.Sambalpur Municipal corporation Po. Sambalpur Dist.Cuttack	144272

14.12 - SANCTION OF OFF DAY WAGES TO EMPLOYEES OF THE MUNICIPALITY: - OSP 21 - 22

As per Rule 415 of the O.M. Rules -1953, the conditions of the employees of a Municipal Council shall not be more favourable than those of Government servants of the similar standing and status in respect of (a) salary and allowances, (b) leave and leave salary (c) travelling allowance and superannuation and retirement.

The State Government employees are not getting Off day wages. Hence the employees of the Municipality are not eligible to get the Off-day salary.

On checking of the paid acquaintance rolls of salary it reveals that Off Day wages was allowed to Regular employees, on the basis of Council Resolution No. Nil (not kept/ traced in the file) (File No. IV-Esst.90/2019 at page No 66 Dt. 1.11.2019) which violates the govt guide line stated above. Besides this for this drawal neither any sanction order was made nor any permission from the administrator was obtained in the note sheet.

It is further to mention here that, as per Rule 8 of The Orissa Industrial Establishments (national and Festival) holidays Rules 1972, published vide Notification No. SRO 457/63, Dt. 23rd February, 1973, Orissa Gazette Part-3/9.3.1973, every employer of an industrial establishment shall, before the 31st January of every year, submit to the Inspector (having jurisdiction in the area appointed under the Act), an annual return in Form V (Total number of persons employed during the year & Number of persons who were paid wages for the National and Festival holidays (Separate figures for each day) for the year ending 31st December immediately preceding and

As per Rule 9. (1) Every employer of an industrial establishment shall maintain a muster roll in Form VI.

No such documents (Form No. V & VI) were neither produced nor also traced by audit.

Hence, due to the above reasons, the payment of Off day wages is not admitted in audit and needs recovery.

The details of inadmissible payment of Off day wages to a tune of Rs. 219921.00 paid during the year under audit is furnished below.

HEAD	PAY	DA	NET PAYABLE	VOUCHER NO.
General Establishment	76041.00	88254.00	164295.00	650/16.11.2019
Sweeper Establishment Section	23088.00	32538.00	55626.00	

TOTAL	99129.00	120792.00	219921.00
-------	----------	-----------	-----------

Objection memo issued to clarify, why the above payment shall not be treated as inadmissible and suggested for recovery from the official(s) found responsible as this establishment is neither covered under Industrial Establishment nor any documents were maintained by this Municipality as per Rule of Industrial Establishment.

In response to objection memo local authority replied that " The Municipal employees are getting off day allowance as per the previous council resolution. Hence, now the objection will be placed before the next council meeting. for further course of action."

The reply of the local authority is not acceptable as the payment was made by violating the Rules discussed above. Hence steps may be taken to effect recovery from the concerned staff(s) to whom payment was made failing which Sri Pabitra Kumar Behera, EO found responsible for this.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

SIno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Pabitra kumar Behera	EO	at. Choudwar Municipality Po. Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	219921

14.13 - EXCESS PAYMENT ALLOWED TO DATA ENTRY OPERATOR ENGAGED IN DLR BASIS: - OSP 22 to 24

As per Office Memorandum No. 13827/W Dt.16.09.2017 of Work Department which was concurred by the Finance Department U.O.R. No. 56/WF-I Dt.24.8.2017, the monthly remuneration of Computer operator was fixed @5200.00 per month w.e.f. 1.7.2013 as **this post is not covered by the Notification of Labour & Employment Department.**

1. As per Section 73(2) OF Orissa Municipal Act, 1950, in case of emergency the Municipal Council may make provision for temporary employment under it for a period not exceeding 44 days. This means that beyond 44 days the council have no power to continue any person in service appointed as NMR/DLR etc. Continuance of such, attracts penal action as provided under section 75-A of Orissa Municipal Act-1950.
2. As per Lr. No. 12204/HUD Dt. 19.04.2000 of Secretary to Govt., H & UD Department, action will initiated against the persons who have (i) authorised such employment (ii) issued orders for such employment.
3. As per Lr. No. 17815(45)/F Dt. 12.04.1993, Engagement of persons on daily wages or office and field works without special sanction of Finance Department is here by banned. Violation of these instructions will result in fixation of personal responsibility on the officer engaging such persons and also on person disbursing the wages to the concerned persons.

On checking of the Account Cash Book w.r.t. Vouchers it reveals that a sum of Rs.503255.00 was paid towards remuneration by violating the above rules during the year under audit out of which **Rs. 112611.00** was paid in excess as per the above govt. orders., the details of which are furnished below.

AMOUNT PAID								
MONTH	NO. OF DAYS	RATE	WAGES	SERVICE CHARGES	GROSS	CGST & SGST	Employers Share (EPF & ESI)	TOTAL
Jan-19	27	430	11610	1102.95	12712.95	2288.331	2078.19	17079.47

Feb-19	24	430	10320	980.4	11300.4	2034.072	1847.28	15181.75
Mar-19	26	430	11180	1062.1	12242.1	2203.578	2001.22	16446.9
Apr-19	26	430	11180	1062.1	12242.1	2203.578	2001.22	16446.9
May-19	27	430	11610	1102.95	12712.95	2288.331	2078.19	17079.47
Jun-19	25	436.3	10907.5	1036.213	11943.71	2149.868	1952.443	16046.02
Jul-19	27	436.3	11780.1	1119.11	12899.21	2321.858	2108.638	17329.71
Aug-19	27	436.3	11780.1	1119.11	12899.21	2321.858	2108.638	17329.71
Sep-19	25	436.3	10907.5	1036.213	11943.71	2149.868	1952.443	16046.02
Oct-19	27	448	12096	1028.16	13124.16	2362.349	2165.184	17651.69
Nov-19	26	448	11648	990.08	12638.08	2274.854	2084.992	16997.93
Dec-19	26	448	11648	990.08	12638.08	2274.854	2084.992	16997.93
Jan-20	27	448	12096	1028.16	13124.16	2362.349	2165.184	17651.69
Feb-20	25	448	11200	952	12152	2187.36	2004.8	16344.16
			159963.2	14609.626	174572.82	31423.11	28633.41	234629.3

CALCULATION OF AMOUNT ADMISSIBLE AND EXCESS PAYMENT: -

AMOUNT ADMISSIBLE								TOTAL EXCESS / person	No. of employees	Excess paid
MONTH	WAGES	SERVIC E CHAR GES	GROSS	CGST & SGST	Employee r Share (EPF & ESI)	TOTAL	Amount paid			
Jan-19	8880	843.6	9723.6	1750.248	1589.52	13063.37	17079.47	4016.103	2	8032.206
Feb-19	8880	843.6	9723.6	1750.248	1589.52	13063.37	15181.75	2118.384	2	4236.768
Mar-19	8880	843.6	9723.6	1750.248	1589.52	13063.37	16446.9	3383.53	2	6767.06
Apr-19	8880	843.6	9723.6	1750.248	1589.52	13063.37	16446.9	3383.53	2	6767.06
May-19	8880	843.6	9723.6	1750.248	1589.52	13063.37	17079.47	4016.103	2	8032.206
Jun-19	8880	843.6	9723.6	1750.248	1589.52	13063.37	16046.02	2982.652	2	5965.305
Jul-19	8880	843.6	9723.6	1750.248	1589.52	13063.37	17329.71	4266.338	2	8532.675
Aug-19	8880	843.6	9723.6	1750.248	1589.52	13063.37	17329.71	4266.338	2	8532.675
Sep-19	8880	843.6	9723.6	1750.248	1589.52	13063.37	16046.02	2982.652	2	5965.305
Oct-19	8880	754.8	9634.8	1734.264	1589.52	12958.58	17651.69	4693.109	2	9386.218
Nov-19	8880	754.8	9634.8	1734.264	1589.52	12958.58	16997.93	4039.342	2	8078.685
Dec-19	8880	754.8	9634.8	1734.264	1589.52	12958.58	16997.93	4039.342	2	8078.685

Jan-20	8880	754.8	9634.8	1734.26 4	1589.52	12958.5 8	17651.6 9	4693.10 9	3	14079.3 3
Feb-20	8880	754.8	9634.8	1734.26 4	1589.52	12958.5 8	16344.1 6	3385.57 6	3	10156.7 3
	124320	11366.4	135686. 4	24423.5 52	22253.2 8	182363. 2				112610. 9

Hence objection was issued to confirm the fact and figures stated above and to offered comments if any in the following points.

1. Whether permission was accorded for such appointment or not from the competent authority, if yes the same may please be produced before audit for verification.
2. Whether there is any sanctioned post for Computer Operator/ Data entry operator, if yes, the same may please be produced before audit for verification.
3. Supporting documents in support of rate of remuneration provided.

In response to objection memo local authority replied that remuneration/wages are given as per agreement made previously. However, steps will be taken during the next agreement.

The reply of the local authority fails to settle the objection. Hence steps may be taken to effect recovery from the persons(s) concerned failing which the above excess payment, the following official(s) (payment authority and concerned dealing assistant at the time of agreement) are found responsible for this.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

S/no	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Satyabrata Mantri	EO	at.Sambalpur Municipal corporation Po. Sambalpur Dist.Cuttack	31416
2	Pabitra kumar Behera	EO	at. Choudwar Municipality Po. Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	24890
3	Santosh Kumar Hota	Tax Collector	at. Choudwar Municipality, Choudwar, District- Cuttack	56305

14.14 - NON-DISENGAGEMENT OF AMIN FROM OUTSOURCES AFTER APPOINTMENT OF REGULAR AMIN: -(OSP 25)

On checking of the accountant cash book w.r.t. vouchers it reveals that Sri SidhinathMantry was appointed as

Amin vide Lr. No. 457 Dt. 23.2.2019 who joined in his service on 1.3.2019. Hence, it needs clarification why the service of the Amin engaged by the Sanskruti Associates Private Ltd. was not discontinued by which municipality sustained loss Rs. 56824.00, the details of which are given below.

MONTH	DAYS	RATE	WAGES	SERVIC E CHAR GES	TOTAL	CGST	SGST	EPF	ESI	TOTAL
Mar-19	26	370	9620	913.9	10533.9	948.051	948.051	1309.28 2	408.85	14148.1 3
Apr-19	26	370	9620	913.9	10533.9	948.051	948.051	1309.28 2	408.85	14148.1 3
May-19	27	370	9990	949.05	10939.0 5	984.514 5	984.514 5	1359.63 9	424.575	14692.2 9
Jun-19	25	376.3	9407.5	893.712 5	10301.2 1	927.109 1	927.109 1	1280.36 1	399.818 8	13835.6 1
TOTAL			38637.5	3670.56 3	42308.0 6	3807.72 6	3807.72 6	5258.56 4	1642.09 4	56824.1 7

In response to objection memo local authority fails to furnish any reply in the objection memo. Hence, objection stands.

As the municipality sustained loss due to the negligence of duty of the Executive Officer, the above inadmissible payment needs recovery from the Sri Satyabrata Mantry, Ex-EO.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

SIno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Satyabrata Mantri	EO	at.Sambalpur Municipal corporation Po. Sambalpur Dist.Cuttack	56824

14.15 - SANCTION OF MEDICAL ALLOWANCE TO SUDA EMPLOYEES OF THE MUNICIPALITY: - OSP-26

But on checking of the paid acquaintance rolls of salary it reveals that Medical allowance was allowed to employees appointed by SUDA which violates the govt guide line. The details of inadmissible payment of Medical allowance to a tune of Rs. 11962.00 paid during the year under audit is furnished below.

Name of the Employee	Designation	Appointed by	Amount paid	VR. No. & Date
Subhadra Nayak	MIS, Contractual	SUDA	6000.00	186/5.7.2019
Basanti Sahoo	CO, Contractual	SUDA	5962.00	622/8.11.2019
TOTAL			11962.00	

For the above payment clarification was sought through the objection memo in the following points.

1. Guideline for payment of Medical allowance to the above employee.
2. Allotment for the payment of medical allowance.
3. Reasons for non-taking the above expenditure as inadmissible expenditure.

In response to objection memo Rs. 11962.00 was recovered as detailed below.

1. Basanti Saoo, CO Rs. 5962.00 vide MR NO. 79335 Dt. 19.5.2021 and the same was reflected in the cashiers Cash book on 19.5.2021 also.

2. Subhadra Nayak, MIS, Contractual Rs. 6000.00 vide MR No. 79334 Dt. 19.5.2021 and the same was reflected in the cashiers Cash book on 19.5.2021

14.16 - EXCESS PAYMENT DUE TO WRONG FIXATION OF PAY WHILE SANCTIONING RACP:- osp 59 to 60

As per H & UD Department Order No. 3391 DT. 9.2.2016 and Order No. 16998 DT. 17.05.1999 the service of Sri Madhab Prasad Jena, Jr. Asst. (Now Sr. Asst.) was regularised in the Post of Jr. Asst. (LFS Cadre) w.e.f. 17.05.1999 and his pay was also fixed at Rs. 3050.00 in the scale of pay 3050-75-3950-80-4590/- by the District Audit Officer, Local Fund Audit, Khordha vide his letter No. 1478 Dt. 4.4.2016. In pursuance of Govt. in H & UD Deptt. office order No. 16844 Dt. 16.05.2013 he promoted to Sr. Asst in the Scale of pay Rs. 5200-20200/- with grade pay Rs. 2400/- and he joined in the said post on 21.5.2013.

From the above it is clear that, he is admissible to get RACP w.e.f. 1.1.2013 after completion of 10 years & 2nd. MACP w.e.f. 21.5.2019 after completion of 20 years as per H & UD Department Resolution No. 9975 Dt. 23.4.2018. But by ignoring the date of regularisation, ACP and RACP were sanctioned in his favour w.e.f. 1.1.2013 which is not admitted in audit and needs clarification. Besides this, ORSP 2016 was also sanctioned by DAO, LFA, Cuttack vide order No. 871 Dt. 27.2.2020 on the basis of the basic pay arrived after sanction of ACP and 2nd. RACP which is not admitted in audit. The details of pay fixation by audit was furnished below. Hence, clarification sought through objection memo, why the differential amount shall not be suggested for recovery from the persons(s) found responsible for this.

MONTH	PAY DRAWN		PAY DUE	
	PAY	G.PAY	PAY	G.PAY
Jan-06	6510	1900	6510	1900
May-06	6770	1900	6770	1900
9/2006 (ACP)	7030	1900	6770	1900
May-07	7030	1900	7030	1900
Sep-07	7300	1900	7030	1900
May-08	7300	1900	7300	1900
Sep-08	7580	1900	7300	1900
May-09	7580	1900	7580	1900
Sep-09	7870	1900	7580	1900
May-10	7870	1900	7870	1900
Sep-10	8170	1900	7870	1900
May-11	8170	1900	8170	1900
Sep-11	8480	1900	8170	1900
May-12	8480	1900	8480	1900
Sep-12	8800	1900	8480	1900
1/2013 (1st. RACP)	8800	2400	8800	2400
1/13 (2nd. RACP)	9140	4200	8800	2400

Sep-13	9140	4200	8800	2400
Jan-14	9540	4200	9140	2400
Sep-14	9540	4200	9140	2400
Jan-15	9960	4200	9490	2400
Sep-15	9960	4200	9490	2400
Jan-16	37600		31400	Level -7
Jan-17	38700		32300	Level -7
Jan-18	39900		33300	Level -7
Jan-19	41100		34300	Level -7
01-05-2019 to 16.5.19	41100		34300	Level -7
2nd MACP w.e.f. 17.5.19	41100		35900	Level 8
Jan-20	42300		35900	Level 8

CALCULATION OF EXCESS PAYMENT:-

PERIOD	PAY	GP	% DA	DA	TOTAL	PAY	GP	DA	TOTAL	DIFFERENCE /MONTH	EXCESS FOR THE PERIOD
9/2006 to 12/2006	7030.00	1900.00	2	178.6	9108.60	6770.00	1900.00	173.40	8843.40	265.20	1060.80
1/2007 to 4/2007	7030.00	1900.00	6	535.8	9465.80	6770.00	1900.00	520.20	9190.20	275.60	1102.40
9/2007 to 12/2007	7300.00	1900.00	9	828	10028.00	7030.00	1900.00	803.70	9733.70	294.30	1177.20
1/2008 to 4/2008	7300.00	1900.00	12	1104	10304.00	7030.00	1900.00	1071.60	10001.60	302.40	1209.60
9/2008 to 12/2008	7580.00	1900.00	16	1516.8	10996.80	7300.00	1900.00	1472.00	10672.00	324.80	1299.20
1/2009 to 4/2009	7580.00	1900.00	24	2275.2	11755.20	7300.00	1900.00	2208.00	11408.00	347.20	1388.80
9/2009 to 12/2009	7870.00	1900.00	27	2637.9	12407.90	7580.00	1900.00	2559.60	12039.60	368.30	1473.20
1/2010 to 4/2010	7870.00	1900.00	35	3419.5	13189.50	7580.00	1900.00	3318.00	12798.00	391.50	1566.00
9/2010 to	8170.00	1900.00	45	4531.5	14601.50	7870.00	1900.00	4396.50	14166.50	435.00	1740.00

12/2010											
1/2011 to 4/2011	8170.00	1900.00	51	5135.7	15205.7 0	7870.00	1900.00	4982.70	14752.7 0	453.00	1812.00
9/2011 to 12/2011	8480.00	1900.00	58	6020.4	16400.4 0	8170.00	1900.00	5840.60	15910.6 0	489.80	1959.20
1/2012 to 4/2012	8480.00	1900.00	65	6747	17127.0 0	8170.00	1900.00	6545.50	16615.5 0	511.50	2046.00
9/12 tp 12/12	8800.00	1900.00	72	7704	18404.0 0	8480.00	1900.00	7473.60	17853.6 0	550.40	2201.60
1/13 to 6/13	9140.00	4200.00	80	10672	24012.0 0	8800.00	2400.00	8960.00	20160.0 0	3852.00	23112.0 0
7/13 to 12/13	9140.00	4200.00	90	12006	25346.0 0	8800.00	2400.00	10080.0 0	21280.0 0	4066.00	24396.0 0
1/14 to 6/14	9540.00	4200.00	100	13740	27480.0 0	9140.00	2400.00	11540.0 0	23080.0 0	4400.00	26400.0 0
7/14 to 12/14	9540.00	4200.00	107	14701.8	28441.8 0	9140.00	2400.00	12347.8 0	23887.8 0	4554.00	27324.0 0
1/15 to 6/15	9960.00	4200.00	113	16000.8	30160.8 0	9490.00	2400.00	13435.7 0	25325.7 0	4835.10	29010.6 0
7/15 to 12/15	9960.00	4200.00	119	16850.4	31010.4 0	9490.00	2400.00	14149.1 0	26039.1 0	4971.30	29827.8 0
1/16 to 6/16	37600.0 0		0	0	37600.0 0	31400.0 0		0.00	31400.0 0	6200.00	37200.0 0
7/16 to 12/16	37600.0 0		2	752	38352.0 0	31400.0 0		628.00	32028.0 0	6324.00	37944.0 0
1/17 to 6/17	38700.0 0		4	1548	40248.0 0	32300.0 0		1292.00	33592.0 0	6656.00	39936.0 0
7/17 to 12/17	38700.0 0		5	1935	40635.0 0	32300.0 0		1615.00	33915.0 0	6720.00	40320.0 0
1/18 to 6/18	39900.0 0		7	2793	42693.0 0	33300.0 0		2331.00	35631.0 0	7062.00	42372.0 0
7/18 to 12/18	39900.0 0		9	3591	43491.0 0	33300.0 0		2997.00	36297.0 0	7194.00	43164.0 0
1/19 to 16.5.19	21213.0 0		12	2545.56	23758.5 6	17703.0 0		2124.36	19827.3 6	3931.20	3931.20
17.5.19 to 31.5.19	19887.0 0		12	2386.44	22273.4 4	17371.0 0		2084.52	19455.5 2	2817.92	2817.92
Jun-19	41100.0 0		12	4932	46032.0 0	35900.0 0		4308.00	40208.0 0	5824.00	5824.00
7/19 to 12/19	41100.0 0		12	4932	46032.0 0	35900.0 0		4308.00	40208.0 0	5824.00	34944.0 0
1/20 to 2/2020	42300.0 0		17	7191	49491.0 0	35900.0 0		6103.00	42003.0 0	7488.00	14976.0 0

TOTAL	483535. 52
-------	---------------

In response to objection memo local authority replied that, "The Service Book will be sent to Dist. Audit Officer, Cuttack for necessary checking. After return of the service book, necessary action will be taken by the municipal authority".

Hence, local authority advised to send the Service Book for re-checking of the Service Book immediately and to re-calculate the excess payment as per the actual paid in acquittance roll on due and drawn basis. Present audit fails to calculate the exact excess payment amount, as all the period of his service is not confined with this station. Till than RS. 483536.00 is held under objection.

14.17 - EXCESS PAYMENT DUE TO WRONG FIXATION OF DATE OF INCREMENT (OSP 60-62)

On checking of the Service Book of Sri Sujit Kumar Das, TC it reveals that, in pursuance of Govt. in H & UD Department Letter N. 17154/ HUD DT. 28.7.2017 and Lr. No.3806/LFA Dt 10.11.2017 of District Audit Officer, Local Fund Audit, Cuttack his pay was fixed at Rs. 3050/- w.e.f. 30.11.2000 in the scale of pay Rs. 3050-75-3950-80-4590/- (allowing scale of pay of Jr. Asst. to Tax collectors of the ULB). As per above H & UD deptt. resolution, the next date of increment is after completion of 1 year i.e. w.e.f. 1.11.2001. But ignoring the instruction of the H & UD Deptt. resolution his next date of increment was fixed on 1.4.2001 resulted wrong fixation of pay for which clarification was sought through the objection memo. The details of pay fixed by local authority & by the present audit is furnished below.

MONTH	PAY FIXED		TO BE FIXED	
	PAY	G.PAY	PAY	G.PAY
30.11.2000	3050.00		3050.00	
1.4.2001	3125.00		3050.00	
1.11.2001	3125.00		3125.00	
1.4.2002	3200.00		3125.00	
1.11.2002	3200.00		3200.00	
1.4.2003	3275.00		3200.00	
1.11.2003	3275.00		3275.00	
1.4.2004	3350.00		3275.00	
1.11.2004	3350.00		3350.00	
1.4.2005	3425.00		3350.00	
1.11.2005	3425.00		3425.00	
1.1.2006	6380.00	1900.00	6380.00	1900.00
1.4.2006	6630.00	1900.00	6380.00	1900.00
1.11.2006	6630.00	1900.00	6630.00	1900.00
1.4.2007	6890.00	1900.00	6630.00	1900.00
1.11.2007	6890.00	1900.00	6890.00	1900.00
1.4.2008	7160.00	1900.00	6890.00	1900.00
1.11.2008	7160.00	1900.00	7160.00	1900.00
1.4.2009	7440.00	1900.00	7160.00	1900.00
1.11.2009	7440.00	1900.00	7440.00	1900.00
1.4.2010	7720.00	1900.00	7440.00	1900.00

1.11.2010	7720.00	1900.00	7720.00	1900.00
1.4.2011	8010.00	1900.00	7720.00	1900.00
1.11.2011	8010.00	1900.00	8010.00	1900.00
1.4.2012	8310.00	1900.00	8010.00	1900.00
1.11.2012	8310.00	1900.00	8310.00	1900.00
1.1.2013 (RACP)	8310.00	2000.00	8620.00	2000.00
1.4.2013	8620.00	2000.00	8620.00	2000.00
1.1.2014	8620.00	2000.00	8940.00	2000.00
1.4.2014	8940.00	2000.00	8940.00	2000.00
1.1.2015	8940.00	2000.00	9270.00	2000.00
1.4.2015	9270.00	2000.00	9270.00	2000.00
1.12.15	9610.00	2000.00	9270.00	2000.00
1.1.2016	30200.00		30200.00	
1.4.16	31100.00		30200.00	
1.1.17	31100.00		31100.00	
1.4.17	32000.00		31100.00	
1.1.18	32000.00		32000.00	
1.4.18	33000.00		32000.00	
1.1.19	33000.00		33000.00	
1.4.19	34000.00		33000.00	
1.1.20	34000.00		34000.00	

CALCULATION OF EXCESS PAYMENT:-

MONT H	PAY FIXED		% of DA	DA	TOTAL	TO BE FIXED		DA	TOTAL	EXCES S	PERIO D	TOTAL EXCES S
	PAY	G.PAY				PAY	G.PAY					
4/01 to 6/01	3125.0 0		43	1343.7 5	4468.7 5	3050.0 0		1311.5 0	4361.5 0	107.00	3	321.00
7/01 to 10/201	3125.0 0		45	1406.2 5	4531.2 5	3050.0 0		1372.5 0	4422.5 0	109.00	4	436.00
4/02 to 6/02	3200.0 0		49	1568.0 0	4768.0 0	3125.0 0		1531.2 5	4656.2 5	112.00	3	336.00
7/02 to 10/02	3200.0 0		52	1664.0 0	4864.0 0	3125.0 0		1625.0 0	4750.0 0	114.00	4	456.00
4/03 to 6/03	3275.0 0		55	1801.2 5	5076.2 5	3200.0 0		1760.0 0	4960.0 0	116.00	3	348.00
7/03 to 10/03	3275.0 0		59	1932.2 5	5207.2 5	3200.0 0		1888.0 0	5088.0 0	119.00	4	476.00
4/04 to 6/04	3350.0 0		61	2043.5 0	5393.5 0	3275.0 0		1997.7 5	5272.7 5	121.00	3	363.00
7/04 to 10/04	3350.0 0		64	2144.0 0	5494.0 0	3275.0 0		2096.0 0	5371.0 0	123.00	4	492.00
4/05 to 6/05	3425.0 0		67	2294.7 5	5719.7 5	3350.0 0		2244.5 0	5594.5 0	125.00	3	375.00

7/05 to 10/05	3425.0 0	1713.0 0	21	1078.9 8	6216.9 8	3350.0 0	1675.0 0	1055.2 5	6080.2 5	137.00	4	548.00
4/6 to 6/06	6630.0 0	1900.0 0	0	0.00	8530.0 0	6380.0 0	1900.0 0	0.00	8280.0 0	250.00	3	750.00
7/6 to 10/06	6630.0 0	1900.0 0		0.00	8530.0 0	6380.0 0	1900.0 0	0.00	8280.0 0	250.00	4	1000.0 0
4/07 to 6/07	6890.0 0	1900.0 0	6	527.40	9317.4 0	6630.0 0	1900.0 0	511.80	9041.8 0	276.00	3	828.00
7/07 to 10/07	6890.0 0	1900.0 0		0.00	8790.0 0	6630.0 0	1900.0 0	0.00	8530.0 0	260.00	4	1040.0 0
4/08 to 6/08	7160.0 0	1900.0 0	12	1087.2 0	10147. 20	6890.0 0	1900.0 0	1054.8 0	9844.8 0	302.00	3	906.00
7/08 to 10/08	7160.0 0	1900.0 0		0.00	9060.0 0	6890.0 0	1900.0 0	0.00	8790.0 0	270.00	4	1080.0 0
4/09 to 6/09	7440.0 0	1900.0 0	24	2241.6 0	11581. 60	7160.0 0	1900.0 0	2174.4 0	11234. 40	347.00	3	1041.0 0
7/09 to 10/09	7440.0 0	1900.0 0		0.00	9340.0 0	7160.0 0	1900.0 0	0.00	9060.0 0	280.00	4	1120.0 0
4/10 to 6/10	7720.0 0	1900.0 0	35	3367.0 0	12987. 00	7440.0 0	1900.0 0	3269.0 0	12609. 00	378.00	3	1134.0 0
7/10 to 10/10	7720.0 0	1900.0 0		0.00	9620.0 0	7440.0 0	1900.0 0	0.00	9340.0 0	280.00	4	1120.0 0
4/11 to 6/11	8010.0 0	1900.0 0	51	5054.1 0	14964. 10	7720.0 0	1900.0 0	4906.2 0	14526. 20	438.00	3	1314.0 0
7/11 to 10/11	8010.0 0	1900.0 0		0.00	9910.0 0	7720.0 0	1900.0 0	0.00	9620.0 0	290.00	4	1160.0 0
4/12 to 6/12	8310.0 0	1900.0 0	65	6636.5 0	16846. 50	8010.0 0	1900.0 0	6441.5 0	16351. 50	495.00	3	1485.0 0
7/12 to 10/10	8310.0 0	1900.0 0		0.00	10210. 00	8010.0 0	1900.0 0	0.00	9910.0 0	300.00	4	1200.0 0
1/13 to 3/13	8310.0 0	2000.0 0	80	8248.0 0	18558. 00	8620.0 0	2000.0 0	8496.0 0	19116. 00	-558.00	3	-1674.0 0
1/14 to 4/14	8620.0 0	2000.0 0	100	10620. 00	21240. 00	8940.0 0	2000.0 0	10940. 00	21880. 00	-640.00	4	-2560.0 0
1/15 to 3/15	8940.0 0	2000.0 0	113	12362. 20	23302. 20	9270.0 0	2000.0 0	12735. 10	24005. 10	-703.00	3	-2109.0 0
Dec-15	9610.0 0	2000.0 0	119	13815. 90	25425. 90	9270.0 0	2000.0 0	13411. 30	24681. 30	745.00	1	745.00
4/16 to 6/16	31100. 00		0	0.00	31100. 00	30200. 00		0.00	30200. 00	900.00	3	2700.0 0
7/16 to 12/16	31100. 00			0.00	31100. 00	30200. 00		0.00	30200. 00	900.00	6	5400.0 0
4/17 to 6/17	32000. 00		4	1280.0 0	33280. 00	31100. 00		1244.0 0	32344. 00	936.00	3	2808.0 0
7/17 to 12/17	32000. 00			0.00	32000. 00	31100. 00		0.00	31100. 00	900.00	5	4500.0 0

4/18 to 6/18	33000. 00		7	2310.0 0	35310. 00	32000. 00		2240.0 0	34240. 00	1070.0 0	3	3210.0 0
7/18 to 12/18	33000. 00			0.00	33000. 00	32000. 00		0.00	32000. 00	1000.0 0	6	6000.0 0
4/19 to 6/19	34000. 00		12	4080.0 0	38080. 00	33000. 00		3960.0 0	36960. 00	1120.0 0	3	3360.0 0
7/19 to 12/19	34000. 00		12	4080.0 0	38080. 00	33000. 00		3960.0 0	36960. 00	1120.0 0	6	6720.0 0
												48429. 00

In response to objection memo local authority replied that, "The Service Book will be sent to Dist. Audit Officer, Cuttack for necessary checking. After return of the service book, necessary action will be taken by the municipal authority".

Hence, local authority advised to send the Service Book for re-checking of the Service Book immediately and to recalculate the excess payment as per the actual paid in acquittance roll on due and drawn basis. Present audit fails to calculate the exact excess payment amount, as all the period of his service is not confined with this station. Till than RS. 48429.00 is held under objection.

14.18 - EXCESS PAYMENT TO CESU AGAINST CONSUMER No.ICI 084: - (OSP 62 to 63)

On checking of the expenditure side of the accountant cash book w.r.t. vouchers and bills it reveals that a sum of **Rs. 1957.00** was paid in excess to CESU during the month from 5/2019 to 7/2019. The details are furnished below.

a/c No. 13316995, Consn NO ICI084			
BILL DATE	Period of bill	Particulars	Amount
Bill Date. 15.6.2019	1.5.19 to 31.5.2019	Excess payment to adjust (as per bill)	3742.00
Bill Date. 16.7.2019	1.6.19 to 30.6.19	Current month Bill amount (6/19)	1976.00
		Rebate	19.00
		Amount to paid (net bill for payment)	1957.00
		Excess paid amount to adjust	1785.00
		But Amount paid Vr. No. 255/25.7.2019)	1957.00
		Hence Excess payment to adjust	3742.00
Bill DT. 16.8.19	1.7.19 to 31.7.19	Current month as per Bill amount (7/2019)	1976.00
		Rebate	19.00
		Amount to paid (net bill for payment)	1957.00
		Excess paid amount to adjust	1957.00

		But bill says due for payment	171.00
		And Bill paid on 19.8.19 vide Vr. No. 347	171.99
		Loss to ULB (3742.00-1957.00+172.00)	1957.00

In response to objection memo local authority fails to return the objection with due compliance. Hence steps may be taken to adjusted the above amount from the payments to CESU and compliance reported to audit failing which the following officials are found responsible for this as the payment was made without verification of the previous payment bill.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

S/no	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Satyabrata Mantri	EO	at.Sambalpur Municipal corporation Po. Sambalpur Dist.Cuttack	979
2	SK. Rajuddin	Jr. Asst.	at Choudwar Municipality, Choudwar, District- Cuttack	978

14.19 - EXCESS PAYMENT TO CESU AGAINST CONSUMER No.ICI 007: - (OSP 63-64)

On checking of the expenditure side of the accountant cash book w.r.t. vouchers and bills it reveals that a sum of **Rs.52720.00** was paid in excess to CESU during the month from 5/2019 to 7/2019. The details are furnished below.

a/c No. 303113316413, Cons. No. ICI 007			
BILL DATE	Period of bill	Particulars	Amount
Bill Date. 15.6.2019	1.5.19 to 31.5.2019	Excess payment to adjust (as per bill)	507.97
		Current month Bill amount (6/19)	53228.00
		Rebate	512.00
		Amount to paid (net bill for payment)	52208.03
		Amount paid Vr. No. 255/25.7.2019)	52208.03
		Balance to paid (rebate date not availed)	512.00
Bill Dt.16.7.2019	1.6.19 to 30.6.19	Arrear bill	53220.00
		Excess payment to adjust (as per bill)	507.97
		Current month as per Bill amount (6/2019)	53228.00

		Rebate	512.00
		Amount to paid (net bill for payment as per bill)	105428.03
		Amount to paid as per audit (rebate not availed)	53740.00
		And Bill paid vide NO. 255/25.7.19	53228.00
		Balance to paid as arrear	512.00
Bill DT. 16.8.19	1.7.19 to 31.7.19	Arrear bill	52720.00
		Excess payment to adjust (as per bill)	0.00
		Current month as per Bill amount (6/2019)	53862.00
		Rebate	512.00
		Amount to paid (net bill for payment as per bill)	106070.00
		Amount to paid as per audit (rebate not availed)	53350.00
		And Bill paid vide NO. 347/19.8.19	106070.00
		Excess payment / loss of ULB fund	52720.00

In response to objection memo local authority fails to return the original memo with due compliance. Hence steps may be taken to adjusted the above amount from the payments to CESU and compliance reported to audit failing which the following officials are found responsible for this as the payment was made without verification of the previous payment bill.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

SIno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Satyabrata Mantri	EO	at.Sambalpur Municipal corporation Po. Sambalpur Dist.Cuttack	26360
2	SK. Rajuddin	Jr. Asst.	at Choudwar Municipality, Choudwar, District- Cuttack	26360

14.20 - NON-DEDUCTION OF INCOME TAX AND GST FROM THE SERVICE PROVIDER CONTR ACTORS: - (OSP 64 to 66)

As per Income Tax Section 194C. (1) Any person responsible for paying any sum to any resident (hereafter in this section referred to as the contractor) for carrying out any work (**including supply of labour for carrying out any work**) in pursuance of a contract between the contractor and a specified person shall, at the time of credit of such sum to the account of the contractor or at the time of payment thereof in cash or by issue of a cheque or draft or by any other mode, whichever is earlier, deduct an amount equal to—

(i) one per cent where the payment is being made or credit is being given to an individual or a Hindu undivided family;

(ii) **two per cent** where the payment is being made or credit is being given to a person other than an individual or a Hindu undivided family,

Provided that where the aggregate of the amounts of such sums credited or paid or likely to be credited or paid **during the financial year exceeds [seventy-five] thousand rupees**, the person responsible for paying such sums referred to in sub-section (1) shall be liable to deduct income-tax under this section.

TDS @ 2% is required to be deducted on payment made to **the supplier of taxable goods or services of both where the value of such supply under a contract exceeds Rs. 2.5 Lakhs**. The provisions of TDS on GST are applicable from 1st Oct 2018 [**Notification No. 50/2018 – Central Tax dated 13th Sept 2018**] as per section 51 of the Odisha GST Act 2017 communicated by Finance Department, Govt. of Odisha vide its Lr. NO. 30797/F Dt. 25.09.2018.

On checking of the vouchers w.r.t. accountant cash book, it reveals that payment was allowed to the following service providing agencies without deducting the Income Tax as well as GST by violating the above rules.

Tax Deducted at Source (TDS) is a system for collection of Direct Tax in India. Indian Income Tax Act, 1961, mandates that a specified percentage of Tax is required to be deducted by the payer at the time of making certain payments to the payee. The requirement to deduct tax is there for payments such as payment of Commission, interest, salary, royalty, contract payment, brokerage etc. The Tax deducted has to be deposited by the payer to the revenue department on behalf of the payee. In case the payer doesn't deducts' the tax at source, the payer is liable to pay penalty u/s 271C of the ITA because it may cause loss of revenue of **Rs. 711215.00 (Rs. 586656.00 & 124559.00 towards Income Tax and GST respectively)** of the Government, which cannot be admitted in audit and needs clarification. The details are furnished below.

1. MANPOWER SUPPLY FOR OFFICE ESTABLISHMENT: -

PARTICULARS OF PAYMENT	VOUCHER No. & DATE	AMOUNT	INCOME TAX 2%	2% GST
Sanskriti Association for 1/19 to 2/19	80/14-05-19	981764.00	19635.00	19635.00
Sanskriti Association pvtltd 4/2019	132/12-06-19	344095.00	6882.00	6882.00
Sanskriti Association pvt ltd 5/19 to 6/19	267/02-08-19	1359868.00	27197.00	27197.00
Sanskriti Association for 7/19 to 8/19	565/14-10-19	872015.00	17440.00	17440.00
Sanskrutika association for 9/29	679/04-12-19	367823.00	7356.00	7356.00
TOTAL		3925565.00	78510.00	78510.00
KM Enterprises for man power for 10/19	678/4.12.19	420201.00	8404.00	8404.00
KM enterprises man power 11/2019	752/1.1.20	416186.00	8324.00	8324.00
KM enterprises man power for 12/19	863/18.1.20	421626.00	8433.00	8433.00

KM enterprises man power for 1/2020	930/13.2.20	562574.00	11251.00	11251.00
KM enterprises man power for 2/2020	989/18.3.20	481850.00	9637.00	9637.00
TOTAL		2302437.00	46049.00	46049.00

MANPOWER SUPPLY FOR SANITATION:-

PARTICULARS OF PAYMENT	Vr. No. & DATE	AMOUNT	2% IT
Swarnadevi (sanitation) (Nov-18 to Jan 19)	29/03-04-2019	1750170.00	36553.00
Swarnadevi agency 2/19 to May 19	179/01-07-2019	2333560.00	46671.00
Swarnadevi agency for 6/19 to 7/19 & VDA	566/14-10-2019	2651900.00	53038.00
Swarnadevi agency for bill 8/19 & 9/19	649/16-11-2019	1498620.00	29972.00
Swarna Devi Agency ((10/19 to 11/19) & VDA4/19 to 11/19)	867/22-01-2020	1651681.00	33034.00
Swarna Devi Agency 12/19 & 1/20	947/04-03-2020	1579948.00	31599.00
TOTAL		11465879.00	230867.00
Manju Service, (Nov-18 to Jan 19)	30/03-04-2019	1827645.00	35003.00
Manju service 2/19 to 5/19	180/01-07-2019	2411660.00	48233.00
Manju Service 6/19 to 7/19 & VDA	567/14-10-2019	2606528.00	52131.00
Manju Service for cleaning 8/19 & 9/19	651/16-11-2019	1523030.00	30461.00
Manju Service (10/19 to 11/19 & VDA4/19 to 11/19)	868/22-01-2020	1669339.00	33387.00
Manju Service for cleaning 12/19 & 1/20	946/04-03-2020	1600770.00	32015.00
TOTAL		11638972.00	231230.00

In response to objection memo local authority fails to return the objection memo with due compliance. Due to non deduction of the of IT and GST at source, loss of Govt. revenue can not be ruled out. For the non deduction of tax at source, the following officials are found responsible.

SRI SATYABRATA MANTRY, Ex-EO, Rs 206969.00

SRI PABITRA KUMAR BEHERA, EO, Rs. 148639.00

& Sri Debasis Mohapatra, Jr. Asst Rs. 355607.00

14.21 - EXCESS PAYMENT DUE TO WRONG CALCULATION: - (OAP 67 to 69)

Section 15 of the CGST Act 2017 deals with value of taxable supply and Section 15(1) stipulates that “**the value of supply of goods or services or both shall be the transaction value, which is the price actually paid or payable for the said supply of goods or services or both where the supplier and the recipient of the supply are not related and the price is the sole consideration of the supply.**”

Hence, for computing GST on labour charges, the transaction value is considered as the value of supply. The transaction value includes all taxes and duties levied under other statutes except IGST, CGST and SGST. Hence, calculation is to be made in the following formula.

As per Finance Department Lr. No. **11835 /F**, Date: **31.03. 2018**, the employers? contribution towards EPF and ESI for personnel outsourced through service providers will be reimbursed over and above the amount of remuneration.

From the above it is clear that the EPF & ESI amount will be reimbursed after deposit by the service provider. Hence, question of GST on EPF & ESI does not arise. Hence, the formula for calculation of GST is furnished below.

{(Basic amount for labour supply + Service Charge)) x GST %.

But due to adoption of the wrong formula excess amount was allowed to the contractor to a tune of Rs. 73526.00 for which clarification was sought through the objection memo.

Bill as per service provider		Due as per audit		Excess paid
FOR THE MONTH OF OCTOBER, VR No. 678/4.12.2019				
NET SALARY	247168.00	Pay of staff	283311.00	12304.43
EPF EMPLOYEE	33906.00	SERVICE TAX	24081.44	
EPF (EMPLOYEEER)	36725.00	Total	307392.44	
EST EMPLOYEE	1957.00	CGST	27665.00	
ESI EMPLOYEEER	8449.00	SGST	27665.00	
TOTAL	328205.00	Total	362722.44	
Service Tax	27897.43	EPF (EMPLOYEEER)	36725.00	
G. TOTAL	356102.43	ESI EMPLOYEEER	8449.00	
GST	64098.44	Total	407896.44	
PAID	420200.86			
FOR THE MONTH OF NOVEMBER, Vr. No. 752/1.1.2020				
NET SALARY	243514.00	Pay of staff	279095.20	13011.26
EPF EMPLOYEE	33484.00	SERVICE TAX (8.5%)	23723.09	
EPF (EMPLOYEEER)	36264.00	Total	302818.29	
EST EMPLOYEE	2222.00	CGST	27253.65	
ESI EMPLOYEEER	9585.00	SGST	27253.65	
TOTAL	325069.00	Total	357325.58	
SERVICE TAX	27630.87	EPF (EMPLOYEEER)	36264.00	
G. TOTAL	352699.87	ESI EMPLOYEEER	9585.00	
GST	63485.98	Total	403174.58	

PAID	416185.84				
FOR THE MONTH OF DECEMBER, Vr. No. 863/18.1.2020					
NET SALARY	246762.00	Pay of staff	282817.00	13207.22	
EPF EMPLOYEE	34033.00	SERVICE TAX (8.5%)	24039.45		
EPF (EMPLOYEEER)	36863.00	Total	306856.45		
EST EMPLOYEE	2195.00	CGST	27617.08		
ESI EMPLOYEEER	9465.00	SGST	27617.08		
TOTAL	329318.00	Total	362090.61		
SERVICE TAX	27992.03	EPF (EMPLOYEEER)	36863.00		
G. TOTAL	357310.03	ESI EMPLOYEEER	9465.00		
GST	64315.81	Total	408418.61		
PADI	421625.84				
FOR THE MONTH OF JANUARY 2020, Vr. No. 930/13.2.2020					
NET SALARY	308865.00	Pay of staff	377498.00		21442.37
Arrear (oct to Dec)	27924.00	SERVICE TAX (8.5%)	32087.33		
EPF EMPLOYEE	41911.00	Total	409585.33		
EPF (EMPLOYEEER)	45409.00	CGST	36862.68		
EST EMPLOYEE	2887.00	SGST	36862.68		
ESI EMPLOYEEER	12412.00	Total	483310.69		
TOTAL	439408.00	EPF (EMPLOYEEER)	45409.00		
SERVICE TAX	37349.68	ESI EMPLOYEEER	12412.00		
G. TOTAL	476757.68	Total	541131.69		
GST	85816.38				
PADI	562574.06				
FOR THE MONTH OF FEBRUARY 2020, Vr. No. 989/18.3.2020					
NET SALARY	284263.00	Pay of staff	321704.00	13561.20	
EPF EMPLOYEE	35022.00	SERVICE TAX (8.5%)	27344.84		
EPF (EMPLOYEEER)	37930.00	Total	349048.84		
EST EMPLOYEE	2419.00	CGST	31414.40		
ESI EMPLOYEEER	10451.00	SGST	31414.40		
TOTAL	370085.00	Total	411877.63		
SERVICE TAX	31457.23	EPF (EMPLOYEEER)	37930.00		
G. TOTAL	401542.23	ESI EMPLOYEEER	10451.00		
Add Admn. Charges @2%	8030.84	Total	460258.63		
GST	72277.60	Add Admn. Charges @2%	8030.84		
PADI	481850.67	Total	468289.47		

	2302437.27		2228910.79	73526.48
--	------------	--	------------	----------

In response to objection memo local authority fails to return the original memo with due compliance Hence steps maybe taken to effect recovery from the concerned firm failing which the following officials are found responsible for this as the payment was made without proper checking of the bill.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

SIno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Debasis Mahapatra	Jr. Asst.	at Choudwar Municipality, Choudwar, District-Cuttack	36763
2	Pabitra kumar Behera	EO	at. Choudwar Municipality Po. Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	36764

14.22 - INADMISSIBLE PAYMENT TOWARDS GST TOWARDS SERVICE PROVIDER: - (OSP 69 to 71)

The service provider is eligible to claim exemption benefit **under Sr.No.3 of [Notification No.12/2017-Central Tax \(Rate\) dated 28.06.2017](#)** for pure services (supply of manpower, security service) provided to Central Government, State Government, Local Authorities, Governmental Authorities, Government Entities as detailed above subject to the condition that the services provided to these entities mentioned above are provided by way of any activity in relation to any function entrusted to a Panchayat under Article 243G of the Constitution of India or in relation to any function entrusted to a **Municipality under Article 243W of the Constitution of India**.

It is to mention here that 243W of the Constitution of India has entrusted the following functions to the municipalities:

1. Urban planning including town planning.
2. Regulation of land-use and construction of buildings.
3. Planning for economic and social development.
4. Roads and bridges.
5. Water supply for domestic, industrial and commercial purposes.
6. .Public health, sanitation conservancy and solid waste management.
7. Fire services.
8. Urban forestry, protection of the environment and promotion of ecological aspects.
9. Safeguarding the interests of weaker sections of society, including the handicapped and mentally retarded.
10. Slum improvement and upgradation.
11. Urban poverty alleviation.
12. Provision of urban amenities and facilities such as parks, gardens,, playgrounds.
13. Promotion of cultural, educational and aesthetic aspects.
14. Burials and burial grounds; cremations, cremation grounds; and electric crematoriums.
15. Cattle pounds; prevention of cruelty to animals.
16. Vital statistics including registration of births and deaths.
17. Public amenities including street lighting, parking lots, bus stops and public conveniences.
18. Regulation of slaughter houses and tanneries.

The employees outsourced by this Municipality were utilised for performing the aforesaid activities. Hence the Man power provider of the Municipality is eligible to claim exemption benefit under Sr.No.3 of [Notification No.](#)

12/2017-Central Tax (Rate) dated 28.06.2017 for pure services (supply of manpower, security service) provided to this Municipality for the reasons discussed hereinabove.

But during the course of audit, it is revealed that a sum of Rs. 877526.00 was paid towards GST which is not admissible in audit and clarification was sought through the objection memo

PARTICULARS OF PAYMENT	VOUCHER No. & DATE	GST PAID
Sanskriti Association for January 19 to March 19	80/14-05-2019	133042.48
Sanskriti Association Pvt Ltd 4/2019	132/12-06-2019	46600.6
Sanskriti Association Pvt Ltd 5/19 to 6/19	267/02-08-2019	194961.76
Sanskriti Association for 7/19 to 8/19	565/14-10-2019	104609.74
Sanskriti Association for 9/29	679/04-12-2019	48317.22
TOTAL		527531.8
KM Enterprises for man power for 10/19	678/4.12.2019	64098.4365
KM Enterprises man power 11/2019	752/1.1.2020	63485.9757
KM Enterprises man power for 12/19	863/18.1.2020	64315.8054
KM Enterprises man power for 1/2020	930/13.2.2020	85816.3824
KM Enterprises man power for 2/2020	989/18.3.2020	72277.6005
TOTAL		349994.2005
G.TOTAL		877526.0005

In response to objection memo local authority replied "after correspondence with the KM Enterprises Man Power, bill for 4/2020 was received without GST".

The reply of the local authority fails to settle the objection because municipality has already sustained loss to a tune of Rs. 877526.00 during the FY 2019-20. Hence steps may be taken to ensure that the amounts paid by this Municipality were deposited by the concerned service providers in the Govt. against each bill and compliance reported to audit failing which Rs.877526.00 needs recovery from the following official(s).

Responsible Person for this paragraph

S/no	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Satyabrata Mantri	EO	at.Sambalpur Municipal corporation Po. Sambalpur Dist.Cuttack	479215
2	Pabitra kumar Behera	EO	at. Choudwar Municipality Po. Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	398311

14.23 - EXCESS PAYMENT TO KANTAWALA DUE TO ENGAGEMENT THROUGH OUTSOURCE ON DAILY

WAGES BASIS BY VIOLATING GOVT. RULES: -(OSP 71 to 81)

Govt. of Odisha, Food Supplies and Consumer Welfare Department has fixed the honorarium of JyoganaSahayaka of the state engaged in PDS distribution at Rs. **6000.00 (six thousand only) per month**, subject to condition that the honorarium may not exceed 80% of the total amount of commission accrued by the institution from PDS **vide its Lr. NO. 20271 Dt. 26.10.2018**

During the course audit it is observed that PDS work was going on in this Municipality. For the smooth distribution of the PDS goods, the following employees were engaged under the designation "Kantawala". During audit the following irregularities were noticed.

1. Kantawal/JyoganaSahayaka were engaged through outsourced manpower's and payment was allowed under Unskilled labour rate by violating the above rule.
2. Expenditure was charged to Municipal fund instead of PDS fund.

As the engagement was made by violating the Govt. instruction, Municipal sustained loss to a tune of Rs. 548625.00as calculated below. Hence in needs clarification, why the differential amount shall not be suggested for recovery.

Name of employee	MONTH	DAYS	RATE	BASIC	S. CHARGE	TOTAL	GST	TOTAL	EPF	ESI	TOTAL	ADMINISTRATIVE	EXCESS PAID
Bijay Ku. Sahoo	Jan-19	27	224.3	6056.1	575.32 95	6631.4 3	1193.6 57	7825.0 87	726.73 2	248.30 01	8800.1 19	6000	2800.1 19
Harae krushna Sahoo	Jan-19	27	224.3	6056.1	575.32 95	6631.4 3	1193.6 57	7825.0 87	726.73 2	248.30 01	8800.1 19	6000	2800.1 19
Iswal Ch. Gochhayat	Jan-19	27	224.3	6056.1	575.32 95	6631.4 3	1193.6 57	7825.0 87	726.73 2	248.30 01	8800.1 19	6000	2800.1 19
Pradeep Ku. Sahoo	Jan-19	27	224.3	6056.1	575.32 95	6631.4 3	1193.6 57	7825.0 87	726.73 2	248.30 01	8800.1 19	6000	2800.1 19
Laxmidhar Pradhan	Jan-19	27	224.3	6056.1	575.32 95	6631.4 3	1193.6 57	7825.0 87	726.73 2	248.30 01	8800.1 19	6000	2800.1 19
Ratnakar Sahoo	Jan-19	27	224.3	6056.1	575.32 95	6631.4 3	1193.6 57	7825.0 87	726.73 2	248.30 01	8800.1 19	6000	2800.1 19
Hemanta Ku. Swain	Jan-19	27	224.3	6056.1	575.32 95	6631.4 3	1193.6 57	7825.0 87	726.73 2	248.30 01	8800.1 19	6000	2800.1 19
Rajkishore Das	Jan-19	27	224.3	6056.1	575.32 95	6631.4 3	1193.6 57	7825.0 87	726.73 2	248.30 01	8800.1 19	6000	2800.1 19
Asutosh Parid	Jan-19	27	224.3	6056.1	575.32 95	6631.4 3	1193.6 57	7825.0 87	726.73 2	248.30 01	8800.1 19	6000	2800.1 19

a													
Bijay Ku. Sahoo	Feb-19	24	224.3	5383.2	511.404	5894.604	1061.029	6955.633	645.984	220.712	7822.328	6000	1822.328
Harae krushna Sahoo	Feb-19	24	224.3	5383.2	511.404	5894.604	1061.029	6955.633	645.984	220.712	7822.328	6000	1822.328
Iswal Ch. Gochhayat	Feb-19	24	224.3	5383.2	511.404	5894.604	1061.029	6955.633	645.984	220.712	7822.328	6000	1822.328
Laxmidhar Pradhan	Feb-19	24	224.3	5383.2	511.404	5894.604	1061.029	6955.633	645.984	220.712	7822.328	6000	1822.328
Ratnakar Sahoo	Feb-19	24	224.3	5383.2	511.404	5894.604	1061.029	6955.633	645.984	220.712	7822.328	6000	1822.328
Hemanta Ku. Swain	Feb-19	24	224.3	5383.2	511.404	5894.604	1061.029	6955.633	645.984	220.712	7822.328	6000	1822.328
Rajkishore Das	Feb-19	24	224.3	5383.2	511.404	5894.604	1061.029	6955.633	645.984	220.712	7822.328	6000	1822.328
Asutosh Parida	Feb-19	24	224.3	5383.2	511.404	5894.604	1061.029	6955.633	645.984	220.712	7822.328	6000	1822.328
Harae krushna Sahoo	Mar-19	26	224.3	5831.8	554.021	6385.821	1149.448	7535.269	699.816	239.1038	8474.189	6000	2474.189
Iswal Ch. Gochhayat	Mar-19	26	224.3	5831.8	554.021	6385.821	1149.448	7535.269	699.816	239.1038	8474.189	6000	2474.189
Laxmidhar Pradhan	Mar-19	26	224.3	5831.8	554.021	6385.821	1149.448	7535.269	699.816	239.1038	8474.189	6000	2474.189
Ratnakar Sahoo	Mar-19	26	224.3	5831.8	554.021	6385.821	1149.448	7535.269	699.816	239.1038	8474.189	6000	2474.189
Hemanta Ku. Swain	Mar-19	26	224.3	5831.8	554.021	6385.821	1149.448	7535.269	699.816	239.1038	8474.189	6000	2474.189
Rajkishore Das	Mar-19	26	224.3	5831.8	554.021	6385.821	1149.448	7535.269	699.816	239.1038	8474.189	6000	2474.189

Asutosh Parida	Mar-19	26	224.3	5831.8	554.021	6385.821	1149.448	7535.269	699.816	239.1038	8474.189	6000	2474.189
Bijay Ku. Sahoo	Apr-19	26	224.3	5831.8	554.021	6385.821	1149.448	7535.269	699.816	239.1038	8474.189	6000	2474.189
Harae krushna Sahoo	Apr-19	26	224.3	5831.8	554.021	6385.821	1149.448	7535.269	699.816	239.1038	8474.189	6000	2474.189
Iswal Ch. Gochhayat	Apr-19	26	224.3	5831.8	554.021	6385.821	1149.448	7535.269	699.816	239.1038	8474.189	6000	2474.189
Laxmidhar Pradhan	Apr-19	26	224.3	5831.8	554.021	6385.821	1149.448	7535.269	699.816	239.1038	8474.189	6000	2474.189
Ratnakar Sahoo	Apr-19	26	224.3	5831.8	554.021	6385.821	1149.448	7535.269	699.816	239.1038	8474.189	6000	2474.189
Hemanta Ku. Swain	Apr-19	26	224.3	5831.8	554.021	6385.821	1149.448	7535.269	699.816	239.1038	8474.189	6000	2474.189
Rajkishore Das	Apr-19	26	224.3	5831.8	554.021	6385.821	1149.448	7535.269	699.816	239.1038	8474.189	6000	2474.189
Asutosh Parida	Apr-19	26	224.3	5831.8	554.021	6385.821	1149.448	7535.269	699.816	239.1038	8474.189	6000	2474.189
Bijay Ku. Sahoo	May-19	27	224.3	6056.1	575.3295	6631.43	1193.657	7825.087	726.732	248.3001	8800.119	6000	2800.119
Harae krushna Sahoo	May-19	27	224.3	6056.1	575.3295	6631.43	1193.657	7825.087	726.732	248.3001	8800.119	6000	2800.119
Iswal Ch. Gochhayat	May-19	27	224.3	6056.1	575.3295	6631.43	1193.657	7825.087	726.732	248.3001	8800.119	6000	2800.119
Laxmidhar Pradhan	May-19	27	224.3	6056.1	575.3295	6631.43	1193.657	7825.087	726.732	248.3001	8800.119	6000	2800.119
Ratnakar Sahoo	May-19	27	224.3	6056.1	575.3295	6631.43	1193.657	7825.087	726.732	248.3001	8800.119	6000	2800.119
Hemanta Ku.	May-19	27	224.3	6056.1	575.3295	6631.43	1193.657	7825.087	726.732	248.3001	8800.119	6000	2800.119

Swain														
Raj Ki shore Das	May-19	27	224.3	6056.1	575.3295	6631.43	1193.657	7825.087	726.732	248.3001	8800.119	6000	2800.119	
AsutoshParida	May-19	27	224.3	6056.1	575.3295	6631.43	1193.657	7825.087	726.732	248.3001	8800.119	6000	2800.119	
Bijay Ku. Sahoo	Jun-19	25	286.3	7157.5	679.9625	7837.463	1410.743	9248.206	858.9	293.4575	10400.56	6000	4400.56	
Harae krushna Sahoo	Jun-19	25	286.3	7157.5	679.9625	7837.463	1410.743	9248.206	858.9	293.4575	10400.56	6000	4400.56	
Iswal Ch. Gochhayat	Jun-19	25	286.3	7157.5	679.9625	7837.463	1410.743	9248.206	858.9	293.4575	10400.56	6000	4400.56	
Laxmidhar Pradhan	Jun-19	25	286.3	7157.5	679.9625	7837.463	1410.743	9248.206	858.9	293.4575	10400.56	6000	4400.56	
Ratnakar Sahoo	Jun-19	25	286.3	7157.5	679.9625	7837.463	1410.743	9248.206	858.9	293.4575	10400.56	6000	4400.56	
Hemanta Ku. Swain	Jun-19	25	286.3	7157.5	679.9625	7837.463	1410.743	9248.206	858.9	293.4575	10400.56	6000	4400.56	
Raj Ki shore Das	Jun-19	25	286.3	7157.5	679.9625	7837.463	1410.743	9248.206	858.9	293.4575	10400.56	6000	4400.56	
AsutoshParida	Jun-19	25	286.3	7157.5	679.9625	7837.463	1410.743	9248.206	858.9	293.4575	10400.56		10400.56	
Bijay Ku. Sahoo		129	55.7	7185.3	682.6035	7867.904	1416.223	9284.126	862.236	294.5973	10440.96		10440.96	
Harae krushna Sahoo		129	55.7	7185.3	682.6035	7867.904	1416.223	9284.126	862.236	294.5973	10440.96		10440.96	
Iswal Ch. Gochhayat		129	55.7	7185.3	682.6035	7867.904	1416.223	9284.126	862.236	294.5973	10440.96		10440.96	
Laxmidhar Pradhan		129	55.7	7185.3	682.6035	7867.904	1416.223	9284.126	862.236	294.5973	10440.96		10440.96	
Ratna		129	55.7	7185.3	682.6035	7867.904	1416.223	9284.126	862.236	294.5973	10440.96		10440.96	

kar Sahoo					35	04	23	26	6	73	96		96
Hema nta Ku. Swain		129	55.7	7185.3	682.60 35	7867.9 04	1416.2 23	9284.1 26	862.23 6	294.59 73	10440. 96		10440. 96
Raj Ki shore Das		129	55.7	7185.3	682.60 35	7867.9 04	1416.2 23	9284.1 26	862.23 6	294.59 73	10440. 96		10440. 96
Asutos hParid a		129	55.7	7185.3	682.60 35	7867.9 04	1416.2 23	9284.1 26	862.23 6	294.59 73	10440. 96		10440. 96
Bijay Ku. Sahoo		53	62	3286	312.17	3598.1 7	647.67 06	4245.8 41	394.32	134.72 6	4774.8 87		4774.8 87
Harae krushn a Sahoo		53	62	3286	312.17	3598.1 7	647.67 06	4245.8 41	394.32	134.72 6	4774.8 87		4774.8 87
Iswal Ch. G ochha yat		53	62	3286	312.17	3598.1 7	647.67 06	4245.8 41	394.32	134.72 6	4774.8 87		4774.8 87
Laxmi dhar P radhan		53	62	3286	312.17	3598.1 7	647.67 06	4245.8 41	394.32	134.72 6	4774.8 87		4774.8 87
Ratna kar Sahoo		53	62	3286	312.17	3598.1 7	647.67 06	4245.8 41	394.32	134.72 6	4774.8 87		4774.8 87
Hema nta Ku. Swain		53	62	3286	312.17	3598.1 7	647.67 06	4245.8 41	394.32	134.72 6	4774.8 87		4774.8 87
Raj Ki shore Das		53	62	3286	312.17	3598.1 7	647.67 06	4245.8 41	394.32	134.72 6	4774.8 87		4774.8 87
Asutos hParid a		53	62	3286	312.17	3598.1 7	647.67 06	4245.8 41	394.32	134.72 6	4774.8 87		4774.8 87
Bijay Ku. Sahoo	Jul-19	27	286.3	7730.1	734.35 95	8464.4 6	1523.6 03	9988.0 62	927.61 2	316.93 41	11232. 61	6000	5232.6 1
Harae krushn a Sahoo	Jul-19	27	286.3	7730.1	734.35 95	8464.4 6	1523.6 03	9988.0 62	927.61 2	316.93 41	11232. 61	6000	5232.6 1
Iswal Ch. G ochha yat	Jul-19	27	286.3	7730.1	734.35 95	8464.4 6	1523.6 03	9988.0 62	927.61 2	316.93 41	11232. 61	6000	5232.6 1

Laxmi dhar P radhan	Jul-19	27	286.3	7730.1	734.35 95	8464.4 6	1523.6 03	9988.0 62	927.61 2	316.93 41	11232. 61	6000	5232.6 1
Hema nta Ku. Swain	Jul-19	27	286.3	7730.1	734.35 95	8464.4 6	1523.6 03	9988.0 62	927.61 2	316.93 41	11232. 61	6000	5232.6 1
Raj Ki shore Das	Jul-19	27	286.3	7730.1	734.35 95	8464.4 6	1523.6 03	9988.0 62	927.61 2	316.93 41	11232. 61	6000	5232.6 1
Asutos hParid a	Jul-19	27	286.3	7730.1	734.35 95	8464.4 6	1523.6 03	9988.0 62	927.61 2	316.93 41	11232. 61	6000	5232.6 1
Bijay Ku. Sahoo	Aug-19	27	286.3	7730.1	734.35 95	8464.4 6	1523.6 03	9988.0 62	927.61 2	316.93 41	11232. 61	6000	5232.6 1
Harae krushn a Sahoo	Aug-19	27	286.3	7730.1	734.35 95	8464.4 6	1523.6 03	9988.0 62	927.61 2	316.93 41	11232. 61	6000	5232.6 1
Iswal Ch. G ochha yat	Aug-19	27	286.3	7730.1	734.35 95	8464.4 6	1523.6 03	9988.0 62	927.61 2	316.93 41	11232. 61	6000	5232.6 1
Laxmi dhar P radhan	Aug-19	27	286.3	7730.1	734.35 95	8464.4 6	1523.6 03	9988.0 62	927.61 2	316.93 41	11232. 61	6000	5232.6 1
Hema nta Ku. Swain	Aug-19	27	286.3	7730.1	734.35 95	8464.4 6	1523.6 03	9988.0 62	927.61 2	316.93 41	11232. 61	6000	5232.6 1
Raj Ki shore Das	Aug-19	27	286.3	7730.1	734.35 95	8464.4 6	1523.6 03	9988.0 62	927.61 2	316.93 41	11232. 61	6000	5232.6 1
Asutos hParid a	Aug-19	27	286.3	7730.1	734.35 95	8464.4 6	1523.6 03	9988.0 62	927.61 2	316.93 41	11232. 61	6000	5232.6 1
Bijay Ku. Sahoo	Sep-19	25	286.3	7157.5	679.96 25	7837.4 63	1410.7 43	9248.2 06	858.9	293.45 75	10400. 56	6000	4400.5 6
Harae krushn a Sahoo	Sep-19	25	286.3	7157.5	679.96 25	7837.4 63	1410.7 43	9248.2 06	858.9	293.45 75	10400. 56	6000	4400.5 6
Iswal Ch. G ochha yat	Sep-19	25	286.3	7157.5	679.96 25	7837.4 63	1410.7 43	9248.2 06	858.9	293.45 75	10400. 56	6000	4400.5 6
Laxmi	Sep-19	25	286.3	7157.5	679.96	7837.4	1410.7	9248.2	858.9	293.45	10400.	6000	4400.5

dhar P radhan	9				25	63	43	06		75	56		6
Hema nta Ku. Swain	Sep-19	25	286.3	7157.5	679.96 25	7837.4 63	1410.7 43	9248.2 06	858.9	293.45 75	10400. 56	6000	4400.5 6
Raj Ki shore Das	Sep-19	25	286.3	7157.5	679.96 25	7837.4 63	1410.7 43	9248.2 06	858.9	293.45 75	10400. 56	6000	4400.5 6
Asutos hParid a	Sep-19	25	286.3	7157.5	679.96 25	7837.4 63	1410.7 43	9248.2 06	858.9	293.45 75	10400. 56	6000	4400.5 6
Bijay Ku. Sahoo	Oct-19	27	286.3	7730.1	763.83 05	8493.9 31	1617.5 23	10111. 45	1004.9 13	251.22 83	11367. 6	6000	5367.6
Harae krushn a Sahoo	Oct-19	27	286.3	7730.1	763.83 05	8493.9 31	1617.5 23	10111. 45	1004.9 13	251.22 83	11367. 6	6000	5367.6
Iswal Ch. G ochha yat	Oct-19	27	286.3	7730.1	763.83 05	8493.9 31	1617.5 23	10111. 45	1004.9 13	251.22 83	11367. 6	6000	5367.6
Laxmi dhar P radhan	Oct-19	27	286.3	7730.1	763.83 05	8493.9 31	1617.5 23	10111. 45	1004.9 13	251.22 83	11367. 6	6000	5367.6
Hema nta Ku. Swain	Oct-19	27	286.3	7730.1	763.83 05	8493.9 31	1617.5 23	10111. 45	1004.9 13	251.22 83	11367. 6	6000	5367.6
Raj Ki shore Das	Oct-19	27	286.3	7730.1	763.83 05	8493.9 31	1617.5 23	10111. 45	1004.9 13	251.22 83	11367. 6	6000	5367.6
Asutos hParid a	Oct-19	27	286.3	7730.1	763.83 05	8493.9 31	1617.5 23	10111. 45	1004.9 13	251.22 83	11367. 6	6000	5367.6
Bijay Ku. Sahoo	Nov-19	26	286.3	7443.8	735.54 05	8179.3 4	1557.6 15	9736.9 56	967.69 4	241.92 35	10946. 57	6000	4946.5 7
Harae krushn a Sahoo	Nov-19	26	286.3	7443.8	735.54 05	8179.3 4	1557.6 15	9736.9 56	967.69 4	241.92 35	10946. 57	6000	4946.5 7
Iswal Ch. G ochha yat	Nov-19	26	286.3	7443.8	735.54 05	8179.3 4	1557.6 15	9736.9 56	967.69 4	241.92 35	10946. 57	6000	4946.5 7
Laxmi dhar P radhan	Nov-19	26	286.3	7443.8	735.54 05	8179.3 4	1557.6 15	9736.9 56	967.69 4	241.92 35	10946. 57	6000	4946.5 7

Hema nta Ku. Swain	Nov-1 9	26	286.3	7443.8	735.54 05	8179.3 4	1557.6 15	9736.9 56	967.69 4	241.92 35	10946. 57	6000	4946.5 7
Raj Ki shore Das	Nov-1 9	26	286.3	7443.8	735.54 05	8179.3 4	1557.6 15	9736.9 56	967.69 4	241.92 35	10946. 57	6000	4946.5 7
Asutos hParid a	Nov-1 9	26	286.3	7443.8	735.54 05	8179.3 4	1557.6 15	9736.9 56	967.69 4	241.92 35	10946. 57	6000	4946.5 7
Bijay Ku. Sahoo	Dec-1 9	26	286.3	7443.8	735.54 05	8179.3 4	1557.6 15	9736.9 56	967.69 4	241.92 35	10946. 57	6000	4946.5 7
Harae krushn a Sahoo	Dec-1 9	26	286.3	7443.8	735.54 05	8179.3 4	1557.6 15	9736.9 56	967.69 4	241.92 35	10946. 57	6000	4946.5 7
Iswal Ch. G ochha yat	Dec-1 9	26	286.3	7443.8	735.54 05	8179.3 4	1557.6 15	9736.9 56	967.69 4	241.92 35	10946. 57	6000	4946.5 7
Laxmi dhar P radhan	Dec-1 9	26	286.3	7443.8	735.54 05	8179.3 4	1557.6 15	9736.9 56	967.69 4	241.92 35	10946. 57	6000	4946.5 7
Hema nta Ku. Swain	Dec-1 9	26	286.3	7443.8	735.54 05	8179.3 4	1557.6 15	9736.9 56	967.69 4	241.92 35	10946. 57	6000	4946.5 7
Raj Ki shore Das	Dec-1 9	26	286.3	7443.8	735.54 05	8179.3 4	1557.6 15	9736.9 56	967.69 4	241.92 35	10946. 57	6000	4946.5 7
Asutos hParid a	Dec-1 9	26	286.3	7443.8	735.54 05	8179.3 4	1557.6 15	9736.9 56	967.69 4	241.92 35	10946. 57	6000	4946.5 7
Bijay Ku. Sahoo	Jan-20	27	298	8046	795.04 54	8841.0 45	1683.6 26	10524. 67	1045.9 8	261.49 5	11832. 15	6000	5832.1 5
Harae krushn a Sahoo	Jan-20	27	298	8046	795.04 54	8841.0 45	1683.6 26	10524. 67	1045.9 8	261.49 5	11832. 15	6000	5832.1 5
Iswal Ch. G ochha yat	Jan-20	27	298	8046	795.04 54	8841.0 45	1683.6 26	10524. 67	1045.9 8	261.49 5	11832. 15	6000	5832.1 5
Laxmi dhar P radhan	Jan-20	27	298	8046	795.04 54	8841.0 45	1683.6 26	10524. 67	1045.9 8	261.49 5	11832. 15	6000	5832.1 5
Hema	Jan-20	27	298	8046	795.04	8841.0	1683.6	10524.	1045.9	261.49	11832.	6000	5832.1

nta Ku. Swain					54	45	26	67	8	5	15		5
Raj Ki shore Das	Jan-20	27	298	8046	795.04 54	8841.0 45	1683.6 26	10524. 67	1045.9 8	261.49 5	11832. 15	6000	5832.1 5
Asutos hParid a	Jan-20	27	298	8046	795.04 54	8841.0 45	1683.6 26	10524. 67	1045.9 8	261.49 5	11832. 15	6000	5832.1 5
Bijay Ku. Sahoo	Feb-2 0	25	298	7450	736.15 31	8186.1 53	1558.9 13	9745.0 66	968.5	242.12 5	10955. 69	6000	4955.6 9
Harae krushn a Sahoo	Feb-2 0	25	298	7450	736.15 31	8186.1 53	1558.9 13	9745.0 66	968.5	242.12 5	10955. 69	6000	4955.6 9
Iswal Ch. G ochha yat	Feb-2 0	25	298	7450	736.15 31	8186.1 53	1558.9 13	9745.0 66	968.5	242.12 5	10955. 69	6000	4955.6 9
Laxmi dhar P radhan	Feb-2 0	25	298	7450	736.15 31	8186.1 53	1558.9 13	9745.0 66	968.5	242.12 5	10955. 69	6000	4955.6 9
Hema nta Ku. Swain	Feb-2 0	25	298	7450	736.15 31	8186.1 53	1558.9 13	9745.0 66	968.5	242.12 5	10955. 69	6000	4955.6 9
Raj Ki shore Das	Feb-2 0	25	298	7450	736.15 31	8186.1 53	1558.9 13	9745.0 66	968.5	242.12 5	10955. 69	6000	4955.6 9
Asutos hParid a	Feb-2 0	25	298	7450	736.15 31	8186.1 53	1558.9 13	9745.0 66	968.5	242.12 5	10955. 69	6000	4955.6 9
TOTAL													54862 5.00

In response to objection memo local authority replied that, the labour engaged in PDS section has been already paid their remuneration from the profit of PDS w.e.f. 1.1.2021. Hence the para may be dropped.

From the above reply it is clear the point raised by the audit is genuine and the same formula was adopted by Municipality w.e.f. 1.1.2021. But the loss due to non adoption of the guideline for the salary period from 1/2019 to 2/2020 (paid during the FY 2019-20) to a tune of Rs. 548625.00 is not admitted in audit. Hence steps may be taken to effect recovery from the concerned employees failing which the following officials are found responsible for this because they were engaged by violating the Govt. guideline.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

S/no	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Satyabrata Mantri	EO	at.Sambalpur Municipal corporation	366285

			Po. Sambalpur Dist.Cuttack	
2	Pabitra kumar Behera	EO	at. Choudwar Municipality Po. Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	182340

14.24 - EXCEEDS AND INADMISSIBLE PAYMENT TO NMR/DLR OF THE MUNICIPALITY: (OSP 81 to 88)

On checking of the paid acquittance roll w.r.t. accountant cash book it reveals that following persons were engaged before 5/1997 and payment was made on days basis labour rate. They were engaged in different sections of the Municipality. It is to mention here that as per **Labour & ESI Department, Govt. of Odisha Notification, Explanation-Clause 2-and as per the minimum wages Act -1938 Clause-13, "The daily minimum rates of wages shall be inclusive of wages payable for the weekly day of rest."** Hence allowing salary during weekly days of rest without any work is not admitted in audit.

Besides this **Rs. 900.00 was given to NMR/ DLRs of the Municipality as Allowance per month against the under taking to refund the same if any objection raised by audit for this payment.** Clarification was sought through the objection to narrate the Rule by which allowance was extended to the following employees. The details are furnished below.

Name of the employee	Month	Particulars of amount paid							Amount admissible				Excess paid
		Rate	Days	Amount	Allowance	Total	EPF	GT PAID	Days	Amount	EPF	GT	
Pratima Pradhan	Mar-19	370.00	31	11470.00	900.00	12370.00	1626.66	13996.66	27	9990.00	1313.69	11303.69	2692.97
Chandan kumar Das	Mar-19	370.00	31	11470.00	900.00	12370.00	1626.66	13996.66	27	9990.00	1313.69	11303.69	2692.97
Amarendra Behera	Mar-19	280.00	31	8680.00	900.00	9580.00	1259.77	10839.77	27	7560.00	994.14	8554.14	2285.63
Jaganath Panda	Mar-19	280.00	31	8680.00	900.00	9580.00	1259.77	10839.77	27	7560.00	994.14	8554.14	2285.63
Bidyadhar Rana	Mar-19	280.00	31	8680.00	900.00	9580.00	1259.77	10839.77	27	7560.00	994.14	8554.14	2285.63
Bimala lochan Mohanty	Mar-19	370.00	31	11470.00	900.00	12370.00	1626.66	13996.66	27	9990.00	1313.69	11303.69	2692.97
Durgach Mohanty	Mar-19	370.00	31	11470.00	900.00	12370.00	1626.66	13996.66	27	9990.00	1313.69	11303.69	2692.97
Lochan kumar	Mar-19	370.00	31	11470.00	900.00	12370.00	1626.66	13996.66	27	9990.00	1313.69	11303.69	2692.97

Sahoo													
Nabaki shore Jena	Mar-19	280.00	31	8680.00	900.00	9580.00	1259.77	10839.77	27	7560.00	994.14	8554.14	2285.63
Pratima Pradhan	Apr-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Chandan ku Das	Apr-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Amarendra Behera	Apr-19	286.30	30	8589.00	900.00	9489.00	1247.80	10736.80	26	7443.80	978.86	8422.66	2314.14
Jaganath Panda	Apr-19	286.30	30	8589.00	900.00	9489.00	1247.80	10736.80	26	7443.80	978.86	8422.66	2314.14
Bidyadhar Rana	Apr-19	286.30	30	8589.00	900.00	9489.00	1247.80	10736.80	26	7443.80	978.86	8422.66	2314.14
Bimala lochan Mohanty	Apr-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Durgach Mohanty	Apr-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Lochan ku Sahoo	Apr-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Nabaki shore Jena	Apr-19	286.30	30	8589.00	900.00	9489.00	1247.80	10736.80	26	7443.80	978.86	8422.66	2314.14
Pratima Pradhan	May-19	376.30	31	11665.30	900.00	12565.30	1652.34	14217.64	27	10160.10	1336.05	11496.15	2721.49
Chandan ku Das	May-19	376.30	31	11665.30	900.00	12565.30	1652.34	14217.64	27	10160.10	1336.05	11496.15	2721.49
Amarendra Behera	May-19	286.30	31	8875.30	900.00	9775.30	1285.45	11060.75	27	7730.10	1016.51	8746.61	2314.14
Jaganath Panda	May-19	286.30	31	8875.30	900.00	9775.30	1285.45	11060.75	27	7730.10	1016.51	8746.61	2314.14
Bidyadhar Rana	May-19	286.30	31	8875.30	900.00	9775.30	1285.45	11060.75	27	7730.10	1016.51	8746.61	2314.14

Bimala lochan Mohanty	May-19	376.30	31	11665.30	900.00	12565.30	1652.34	14217.64	27	10160.10	1336.05	11496.15	2721.49
Durgach Mohanty	May-19	376.30	31	11665.30	900.00	12565.30	1652.34	14217.64	27	10160.10	1336.05	11496.15	2721.49
Lochan ku Sahoo	May-19	376.30	31	11665.30	900.00	12565.30	1652.34	14217.64	27	10160.10	1336.05	11496.15	2721.49
Nabakishore Jena	May-19	286.30	30	8589.00	900.00	9489.00	1247.80	10736.80	26	7443.80	978.86	8422.66	2314.14
Pratima Pradhan	Jun-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Chandan ku Das	Jun-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Amarendra Behera	Jun-19	286.30	30	8589.00	900.00	9489.00	1247.80	10736.80	26	7443.80	978.86	8422.66	2314.14
Jaganath Panda	Jun-19	286.30	30	8589.00	900.00	9489.00	1247.80	10736.80	26	7443.80	978.86	8422.66	2314.14
Bidyadhar Rana	Jun-19	286.30	30	8589.00	900.00	9489.00	1247.80	10736.80	26	7443.80	978.86	8422.66	2314.14
Bimala lochan Mohanty	Jun-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Durgach Mohanty	Jun-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Lochan ku Sahoo	Jun-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Nabakishore Jena	Jun-19	286.30	30	8589.00	900.00	9489.00	1247.80	10736.80	26	7443.80	978.86	8422.66	2314.14
Pratima Pradhan	Jul-19	376.30	31	11665.30	900.00	12565.30	1652.34	14217.64	27	10160.10	1336.05	11496.15	2721.49
Chandan ku Das	Jul-19	376.30	31	11665.30	900.00	12565.30	1652.34	14217.64	27	10160.10	1336.05	11496.15	2721.49
Amare	Jul-19	286.30	31	8875.3	900.00	9775.3	1285.4	11060.	27	7730.1	1016.5	8746.6	2314.1

ndra Behera				0		0	5	75		0	1	1	4
Jagan nath Panda	Jul-19	286.30	31	8875.3 0	900.00	9775.3 0	1285.4 5	11060. 75	27	7730.1 0	1016.5 1	8746.6 1	2314.1 4
Bidyad har Rana	Jul-19	286.30	31	8875.3 0	900.00	9775.3 0	1285.4 5	11060. 75	27	7730.1 0	1016.5 1	8746.6 1	2314.1 4
Bimala lochan Mohan ty	Jul-19	376.30	31	11665. 30	900.00	12565. 30	1652.3 4	14217. 64	27	10160. 10	1336.0 5	11496. 15	2721.4 9
Durga ch Mo hanty	Jul-19	376.30	31	11665. 30	900.00	12565. 30	1652.3 4	14217. 64	27	10160. 10	1336.0 5	11496. 15	2721.4 9
Locha n ku Sahoo	Jul-19	376.30	31	11665. 30	900.00	12565. 30	1652.3 4	14217. 64	27	10160. 10	1336.0 5	11496. 15	2721.4 9
Nabaki shore Jena	Jul-19	286.30	31	8875.3 0	900.00	9775.3 0	1285.4 5	11060. 75	27	7730.1 0	1016.5 1	8746.6 1	2314.1 4
Pratim a Prad han	Aug-1 9	376.30	31	11665. 30	900.00	12565. 30	1652.3 4	14217. 64	27	10160. 10	1336.0 5	11496. 15	2721.4 9
Chand an ku Das	Aug-1 9	376.30	31	11665. 30	900.00	12565. 30	1652.3 4	14217. 64	27	10160. 10	1336.0 5	11496. 15	2721.4 9
Amare ndra Behera	Aug-1 9	286.30	31	8875.3 0	900.00	9775.3 0	1285.4 5	11060. 75	27	7730.1 0	1016.5 1	8746.6 1	2314.1 4
Jagan nath Panda	Aug-1 9	286.30	31	8875.3 0	900.00	9775.3 0	1285.4 5	11060. 75	27	7730.1 0	1016.5 1	8746.6 1	2314.1 4
Bidyad har Rana	Aug-1 9	286.30	31	8875.3 0	900.00	9775.3 0	1285.4 5	11060. 75	27	7730.1 0	1016.5 1	8746.6 1	2314.1 4
Bimala lochan Mohan ty	Aug-1 9	376.30	31	11665. 30	900.00	12565. 30	1652.3 4	14217. 64	27	10160. 10	1336.0 5	11496. 15	2721.4 9
Durga ch Mo hanty	Aug-1 9	376.30	31	11665. 30	900.00	12565. 30	1652.3 4	14217. 64	27	10160. 10	1336.0 5	11496. 15	2721.4 9
Locha n ku Sahoo	Aug-1 9	376.30	31	11665. 30	900.00	12565. 30	1652.3 4	14217. 64	27	10160. 10	1336.0 5	11496. 15	2721.4 9
Nabaki	Aug-1	286.30	31	8875.3	900.00	9775.3	1285.4	11060.	27	7730.1	1016.5	8746.6	2314.1

shore Jena	9			0		0	5	75		0	1	1	4
Pratima Pradhan	Sep-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Chandan ku Das	Sep-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Amarendra Behera	Sep-19	286.30	30	8589.00	900.00	9489.00	1247.80	10736.80	26	7443.80	978.86	8422.66	2314.14
Jaganath Panda	Sep-19	286.30	30	8589.00	900.00	9489.00	1247.80	10736.80	26	7443.80	978.86	8422.66	2314.14
Bidyadhar Rana	Sep-19	286.30	30	8589.00	900.00	9489.00	1247.80	10736.80	26	7443.80	978.86	8422.66	2314.14
Bimala lochan Mohanty	Sep-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Durgach Mohanty	Sep-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Lochan ku Sahoo	Sep-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Nabakishore Jena	Sep-19	286.30	30	8589.00	900.00	9489.00	1247.80	10736.80	26	7443.80	978.86	8422.66	2314.14
Pratima Pradhan	Oct-19	376.30	31	11665.30	900.00	12565.30	1652.34	14217.64	27	10160.10	1336.05	11496.15	2721.49
Chandan ku Das	Oct-19	376.30	31	11665.30	900.00	12565.30	1652.34	14217.64	27	10160.10	1336.05	11496.15	2721.49
Amarendra Behera	Oct-19	286.30	31	8875.30	900.00	9775.30	1285.45	11060.75	27	7730.10	1016.51	8746.61	2314.14
Jaganath Panda	Oct-19	286.30	31	8875.30	900.00	9775.30	1285.45	11060.75	27	7730.10	1016.51	8746.61	2314.14
Bidyadhar Rana	Oct-19	286.30	31	8875.30	900.00	9775.30	1285.45	11060.75	27	7730.10	1016.51	8746.61	2314.14
Bimala lochan	Oct-19	376.30	31	11665.30	900.00	12565.30	1652.34	14217.64	27	10160.10	1336.05	11496.15	2721.49

Mohan ty													
Durga ch Mohanty	Oct-19	376.30	31	11665.30	900.00	12565.30	1652.34	14217.64	27	10160.10	1336.05	11496.15	2721.49
Lochan ku Sahoo	Oct-19	376.30	31	11665.30	900.00	12565.30	1652.34	14217.64	27	10160.10	1336.05	11496.15	2721.49
Nabaki shore Jena	Oct-19	286.30	31	8875.30	900.00	9775.30	1285.45	11060.75	27	7730.10	1016.51	8746.61	2314.14
Pratima Pradhan	Nov-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Chandan ku Das	Nov-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Amarendra Behera	Nov-19	286.30	30	8589.00	900.00	9489.00	1247.80	10736.80	26	7443.80	978.86	8422.66	2314.14
Jaganath Panda	Nov-19	286.30	30	8589.00	900.00	9489.00	1247.80	10736.80	26	7443.80	978.86	8422.66	2314.14
Bidyadhar Rana	Nov-19	286.30	30	8589.00	900.00	9489.00	1247.80	10736.80	26	7443.80	978.86	8422.66	2314.14
Bimala lochan Mohanty	Nov-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Durga ch Mohanty	Nov-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Lochan ku Sahoo	Nov-19	376.30	30	11289.00	900.00	12189.00	1602.85	13791.85	26	9783.80	1286.57	11070.37	2721.48
Nabaki shore Jena	Nov-19	286.30	30	8589.00	900.00	9489.00	1247.80	10736.80	26	7443.80	978.86	8422.66	2314.14
Pratima Pradhan	Dec-19	376.30	31	11665.30	900.00	12565.30	1652.34	14217.64	27	10160.10	1336.05	11496.15	2721.49
Chandan ku Das	Dec-19	376.30	31	11665.30	900.00	12565.30	1652.34	14217.64	27	10160.10	1336.05	11496.15	2721.49
Amarendra Behera	Dec-19	286.30	31	8875.30	900.00	9775.30	1285.45	11060.75	27	7730.10	1016.51	8746.61	2314.14

a													
Jagan nath Panda	Dec-1 9	286.30	31	8875.3 0	900.00	9775.3 0	1285.4 5	11060. 75	27	7730.1 0	1016.5 1	8746.6 1	2314.1 4
Bidyad har Rana	Dec-1 9	286.30	31	8875.3 0	900.00	9775.3 0	1285.4 5	11060. 75	27	7730.1 0	1016.5 1	8746.6 1	2314.1 4
Bimala lochan Mohan ty	Dec-1 9	376.30	31	11665. 30	900.00	12565. 30	1652.3 4	14217. 64	27	10160. 10	1336.0 5	11496. 15	2721.4 9
Durga ch Mo hanty	Dec-1 9	376.30	31	11665. 30	900.00	12565. 30	1652.3 4	14217. 64	27	10160. 10	1336.0 5	11496. 15	2721.4 9
Locha n ku Sahoo	Dec-1 9	376.30	31	11665. 30	900.00	12565. 30	1652.3 4	14217. 64	27	10160. 10	1336.0 5	11496. 15	2721.4 9
Nabaki shore Jena	Dec-1 9	286.30	31	8875.3 0	900.00	9775.3 0	1285.4 5	11060. 75	27	7730.1 0	1016.5 1	8746.6 1	2314.1 4
Pratim a Prad han	Jan-20	399.70	31	12390. 70	900.00	13290. 70	1747.7 3	15038. 43	27	10791. 90	1419.1 3	12211. 03	2827.4 0
Chand an ku Das	Jan-20	399.70	31	12390. 70	900.00	13290. 70	1747.7 3	15038. 43	27	10791. 90	1419.1 3	12211. 03	2827.4 0
Amare ndra Beher a	Jan-20	309.70	31	9600.7 0	900.00	10500. 70	1380.8 4	11881. 54	27	8361.9 0	1099.5 9	9461.4 9	2420.0 5
Jagan nath Panda	Jan-20	309.70	31	9600.7 0	900.00	10500. 70	1380.8 4	11881. 54	27	8361.9 0	1099.5 9	9461.4 9	2420.0 5
Bidyad har Rana	Jan-20	399.70	31	12390. 70	900.00	13290. 70	1747.7 3	15038. 43	27	10791. 90	1419.1 3	12211. 03	2827.4 0
Bimala lochan Mohan ty	Jan-20	399.70	31	12390. 70	900.00	13290. 70	1747.7 3	15038. 43	27	10791. 90	1419.1 3	12211. 03	2827.4 0
Durga ch Mo hanty	Jan-20	399.70	31	12390. 70	900.00	13290. 70	1747.7 3	15038. 43	27	10791. 90	1419.1 3	12211. 03	2827.4 0
Locha n ku Sahoo	Jan-20	399.70	31	12390. 70	900.00	13290. 70	1747.7 3	15038. 43	27	10791. 90	1419.1 3	12211. 03	2827.4 0
Nabaki shore Jena	Jan-20	309.70	31	9600.7 0	900.00	10500. 70	1380.8 4	11881. 54	27	8361.9 0	1099.5 9	9461.4 9	2420.0 5

Pratima Pradhan	Feb-20	399.70	29	11591.30	900.00	12491.30	1642.61	14133.91	25	9992.50	1314.01	11306.51	2827.40
Chandan ku Das	Feb-20	399.70	29	11591.30	900.00	12491.30	1642.61	14133.91	25	9992.50	1314.01	11306.51	2827.40
Amarendra Behera	Feb-20	309.70	29	8981.30	900.00	9881.30	1299.39	11180.69	25	7742.50	1018.14	8760.64	2420.05
Jagannath Panda	Feb-20	309.70	29	8981.30	900.00	9881.30	1299.39	11180.69	25	7742.50	1018.14	8760.64	2420.05
Bidyadhar Rana	Feb-20	399.70	29	11591.30	900.00	12491.30	1642.61	14133.91	25	9992.50	1314.01	11306.51	2827.40
Bimalalochan Mohanty	Feb-20	399.70	29	11591.30	900.00	12491.30	1642.61	14133.91	25	9992.50	1314.01	11306.51	2827.40
Durgach Mohanty	Feb-20	399.70	29	11591.30	900.00	12491.30	1642.61	14133.91	25	9992.50	1314.01	11306.51	2827.40
Lochan ku Sahoo	Feb-20	399.70	29	11591.30	900.00	12491.30	1642.61	14133.91	25	9992.50	1314.01	11306.51	2827.40
Nabakishore Jena	Feb-20	309.70	29	8981.30	900.00	9881.30	1299.39	11180.69	25	7742.50	1018.14	8760.64	2420.05
							13815.20.96					11046.88.60	27683.2.36

Name of the employee excess paid

NAME OF THE EMPLOYEE	EXCESS PAID
Pratima Pradhan	32841.14
Chandan ku Das	32841.14
Amarendra Behera	27952.99
Jagannath Panda	27952.99
Bidyadhar Rana	28767.69
Bimalalochan Mohanty	32841.14
Durgach Mohanty	32841.14
Lochan ku Sahoo	32841.14
Nabakishore Jena	27952.99
TOTAL	276832.36

In response to objection memo local authority furnished no reply till the close of audit. Hence effective steps may

be taken to effect recovery from the concerned employees failing the following officials are found responsible for this as the payments were paid by violating the Govt. guidelines.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

Slno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Satyabrata Mantri	EO	at.Sambalpur Municipal corporation Po. Sambalpur Dist.Cuttack	182655
2	Pabitra kumar Behera	EO	at. Choudwar Municipality Po. Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	94177

14.25 - EXCESS PAID THAN THE BILL AVAILABLE IN VOUCHER GUARD FILE: - (OSP 89)

On checking of the vouchers w.r.t. accountant cash book it reveals that a sum of Rs. 58445.00 was paid to The Samaj for publication vide Vr. No. 348 Dt. 19.08.2019 against which bill is available for Rs. 55673.00 resulted excess payment of Rs. 2772.00 for which clarification was sought through the objection memo.

Vr. No. & date	AMOUNT PAID	BILL AVAILABLE AGAINSTPAYMENT	EXCESS PAYMENT	REMARKS
348/19.8.19	4752.00	1980.00	2772.00	Order No. 845/22.3.13
	10870.00	10870.00		
	12852.00	12852.00		
	4998.00	4998.00		
	4498.00	4498.00		
	20475.00	20475.00		
	58445.00	55673.00		

In response to audit objection memo local authority fails to return the objection memo with due compliance. As the payment was made without scrutiny, a sum of Rs. 2772.00 was paid in excess which is not admitted in audit and the same needs recovery from concerned media publisher failing which following officials are found responsible for this.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

Slno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Debasis Panda	Accountant	at. Choudwar Municipality Po.Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	1386
2	Satyabrata Mantri	EO	at.Sambalpur Municipal corporation	1386

			Po. Sambalpur Dist.Cuttack	

14.26 - PAYMENT OF TA TO EXECUTIVE OFFICER WITHOUT SANCTION OF COMPETENT AUTHORITY (OSP 89)

As per Rule 395 of Municipal Rules 1953 " Journeys of the E.O., outside the limits of the Municipality shall be sanctioned by the council and the travelling allowance bill shall be countersigned by the Chairman"

On checking of the vouchers w.r.t. accountant cash book it reveals that a sum of Rs. 3750.00 was paid towards TA of Sri Satyabrata Mantry, Ex-EO for the period from 16.2.2019 to 30.9.2019 vide Vr. No. 583 Dt. 15.10.2019. On checking of the Tour diary and TA Bill kept in the vouchers guard file it reveals that the same were not countersigned by the Chairman/Administrator. Objection memo issued to produce the necessary sanction by council and counter signature of the competent authority in support of such payment as per Rule 395 of the Municipal Rules 1953.

In response to objection memo local authority furnished no reply. Hence, the payment is not admitted in audit and Rs. 3750.00 needs recovery from Sri Satyabrata Mantry, Ex-E.O.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

SIno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Satyabrata Mantri	EO	at.Sambalpur Municipal corporation Po. Sambalpur Dist.Cuttack	3750

14.27 - INSTALATION OF DOUBLE SUBMERSIBLE PUMP AT AAHAR CENTRE: - (OSP 90)

On checking of the vouchers w.r.t. accountant cash book it reveals that there are two submersible pump sets were installed at Aahar Centre, Choudwar during the year under audit. Hence, objection memo issued to justify such double submersible pump installation at AAHAR Centre without any other related work like exaction of earth, installation of pump, installation of MCB board etc. The details of expenditure for such installation/purchase were given below.

1. Paid to Mohanty Engineering corporation for 1 HP-CRI submersible pump set vide Vr. No. 509 Dt. 1.10.2019 for Rs. 14500.00
2. Paid to Champak Ku. Pradhan for purchase of Submersible pump from Bholenath Electrical Spare vide Vr. No. 775/2.1.2020 for Rs. 21112.00

In response to objection memo local authority furnished no reply. Purchase of submersible pump for 2nd time without any requirement is not admitted in audit and Rs. 21112.00 needs recovery from Sri Pabitra Kumar Behera, EO and Sri Champak Ku. Pradhan.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

SIno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Pabitra kumar Behera	EO	at. Choudwar Municipality Po.	10556

			Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	
2	Champak kumar Pradhan	JE	at. Choudwar Municipality po.Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	10556

14.28 - EXPENDITURE WITHOUT BUDGETARY PROVISION/GOVT. APPROVAL:- f(OSP 90-91)

As per Section 117(A) of OM Act. 1950, unless provision has been made in that behalf in a Municipal Budget as approved by the state Govt. no expenditure shall be incurred by the Council without prior approval of the Director.

During the course of audit it is reveals that a sum of Rs. 307852.00 was shown as expenditure towards aahar centre. On cross verification of the Budget approved by the H & UD department for the Choudwar Municipality vide Lr. No. 8733 DT 5.5.2020 for the Financial Year 2019-20, it is revealed that a sum of Rs. 2,00,000.00 is approved for expenditure under other administrative expenses for Aahar centre (acct. Code 254). Hence expenditure beyond the budgetary provision without approval by the state Govt. is not admitted in audit.

Besides this on cross verification of the Aahar file only Rs. 104033.00 (49190.00+3540.00+6785.00+9912.00+25606.00+9000.00) was approved by the Executive Officer for making expenditure.

Besides, this Aahar centre comes under Odisha Society Act. XXI-1860. As per the By Law of the clause 22, The District Aahar Society facilitate the preparation of quarterly action plan for Aahar scheme, mobilise fund for sustainability of Aahar Scheme in the District, Mobilise the both financial and non-financial resources for implementing / supplementing Aahaar Scheme.

Hence local authority requested through the objection memo to produce the Govt. guideline or instruction for making direct expenditure without any order from the competent authority and beyond the budgetary. The details of the expenditures are furnished below.

PARTICULARS OF EXPENDITURE	VR. No. & Dt.	AMOUNT
Advance to Pabitrakumarchoudhury for maintenance of Aahar centre	163/20.6.19	15000.00
Advance adjusted Rs. 15000.00 and paid Rs. 7115.00 towards maintenance of Aahar centre	257/26.7.2019	7115.00
AAHAR towards purchase of AC, (Patra electronics)	439/19.9.19	65800.00
Purchase from Aqua Samrat(Aqua Cooler, Usha made)	500/29.9.19	49190.00
Purchase of submersible pump set from Mohanty Engineering	509/1.10.2019	14500.00
Maintenance of Aahar Centre	576/15.10.19	7500.00
International Accurate certification of ISO certificate	608/6.11.19	3540.00
Colouring of Name plate & purchase of detergent for aahar centre	665/28.11.19	6785.00
Mozzul Berhampur towards purchase of display board for Aahar	718/18.12.19	24780.00

centre		
Paid to Maa Sarala enterprises for Digital Electronic Bill machine for Aahar centre	719/18.12.19	32450.00
Paid to Champak Ku. Pradhan for purchase of Submersible pump for Aahar centre	775/2.1.20	21112.00
Paid to AP Vision & system for CCTV & LED TV at Aahar centre	880/28.1.2020	9912.00
Paid to IFB Industry for AMC of Disk washing machine	928/13.2.20	25606.00
Advance to PabitraKu.Choudhury for maintenance of Aahar centre	945/4.3.20	9000.00
Electric bill of aadhar centre	1014/20.3.20	15562.00
TOTAL		307852.00

In response to objection memo local authority furnished no reply. Hence the payment beyond the budgetary provision is not admitted in audit Rs. 86740.00 (307852.00 – 2,00,000.00- 21112.00 (vide para No. 14.27)) needs recovery from the following Official(s).

Responsible Person for this paragraph

S/no	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Pabitra kumar Behera	EO	at. Choudwar Municipality Po. Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	86740

14.29 - INADMISSIBLE PAYMENT TOWARDS SPECIAL CLEANING: - (OSP 120 to 121)

As per the agreement made on 31.8.2018 with outsource service provider(s),

1. The 2nd party (Service provider) should collect solid waste from the door steps of the households from different streets at scheduled time fixed by the Minicipal authority through tricycle with alarming. (Clause-5)
2. The 2nd party should clean the drains regularly. (Clause-6)
3. The 2nd party should ensure sweeping the roads of every street daily, Kalyaan Mandap, Bus stand, important chhak, weekly market, daily market, railway station twice a day. (Clause-7)
4. The 2nd party should spread/ sprinkle of bleaching power/phenyl every day. (clause-8)
5. The 2nd party should work under close supervision of the 1st party or his authorised person such as Sanitary Inspector. (Clause-9)

As per the Scope of work {Clause (A)} of the tender,

1. The bushes and shrubs from the road side berms and conservancy lanes are to be cleaned by the agency. The road side drains are also to be cleaned. The executing agency after daily collection shall have to ensure complete removal of the entire garbage/ solid wastes from the specified are to the full satisfaction of the Choudwar Municipal authority and in any case he agency does not comply, the Municipal authority may engage any other agency for removal of such solid waste and cost of collection shall be recovered from the bill of the original executing agency. (point 2)
2. The garbage/ solid wastes collected from different places shall have to be loaded into transporting vehicle

and to be transported to the approved to the approved dumping yards. The agency shall have to provide vehicle and labourers as per requirement. For any deviation Municipal authority/ sanitary Inspector may engage number of vehicles and labourers as per requirement and the cost shall be recovered from the monthly bill of the original agency in no case Garbage/ Solid wastes generated in a day shall be retained in the area for more than 24 hours. (Point-3)

3. During the Ganesh Jatra, Durgapuja&KumarpurnimaJatra at choudwar and other festivals the special cleaning work shall be made by the agency. During festival period and other VIP programme the agency shall spread the bleaching/lime stone etc. (Point-4)

But on checking of the vouchers w.r.t. accountant cash book it reveals that a sum of Rs.118329.00 was shown as expenditure towards special cleaning, sanitisation, disinfection and bush cutting of different areas of this Municipalities without mention the ward No., No certificate regarding work other than the Sanitary Inspector who engaged the labourers and received the money. The details are given below.

PARTICULARS OF EXPENDITURE	VOUCHER No & DATE	AMOUNT	PERIOD
Special cleaning for Sanitisation, disinfection & bush cutting	386/21.8.2019	10400.00	17.7.19 TO 31.7.2019
	435/18.9.19	27196.00	1.8.19 TO 31.8.19
	560/14.10.19	30631.00	1.9.19 TO 30.9.19
	611/6.11.2019	16892.00	1.10.119 TO 31.10.19
	747/30.12.2019	33210.00	1.11.19 TO 30.11.2019
TOTAL		118329.00	

As per the agreement, cleaning, bushing cutting, spread/ sprinkle of bleaching power/phenyl every day is the prime duty of the executing agency. It is also to mention here that, there are 4 Nos. of sprayman engaged through outsources man power services for spraying different oils in the Municipal areas. No bleaching was received by any one of the persons engaged in this work. Hence, it is clear from the above that the expenditure shown in the name of special cleaning by the Municipality, without deducting the same from the bill of the executing agency as per agreement is not admitted in audit. Objection memo was issued to intimate the reasons for such cleaning without informing the executing agency, without mentioning the area of cleaning & incurring expenditure by violating the above norms of the agreement.

Payment was released as per the certification of the Sanitary Inspector. It is further to mention here that no correspondence was also made with the Manpower Service providers for cleaning of this drain. Hence, the work shown executed by the municipality instead of Service Providers is not admitted by audit.

It is the duty and responsibility of the Sanitary Inspector to supervise the work of cleaning & sanitation and the Sanitary Inspector fails to discharge his duty properly and as the payment was made to him, the above amount needs recovery from Sri Asit Das, SI.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

SIno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Asit Das	Sanitary Inspector	at. Choudwar Municipality Po. Choudwar Dist. Cuttack	118329

14.30 - IN ADMISSIBLE PAYMENT FOR CLEANING OF MAIN DRAIN: (OSP 122-123)

As per the agreement made on 31.8.2018 with outsource Service Provider(s),

1. The 2nd party (Service provider) should collect solid waste from the door steps of the households from different streets at scheduled time fixed by the Minicipal authority through tricycle with alarming. (Clause-5)
2. The 2nd party should clean the drains regularly. (Clause-6)
3. The 2nd party should ensure sweeping the roads of every street daily, Kalyaan Mandap, Bus stand, important chhak, weekly market, daily market, railway station twice a day. (Clause-7)
4. The 2nd party should spread/ sprinkle of bleaching power/phenyl every day. (clause-8)
5. The 2nd party should work under close supervision of the 1st party or his authorised person such as Sanitary Inspector. (Clause-9)

As per the Scope of work {Clause (A)} tender,

1. The bushes and shrubs from the road side berms and conservancy lanes are to be cleaned by the agency. The road side drains are also to be cleaned. The executing agency after daily collection shall have to ensure complete removal of the entire garbage/ solid wastes from the specified are to the full satisfaction of the Choudwar Municipal authority and in any case he agency does not comply, the Municipal authority may engage any other agency for removal of such solid waste and cost of collection shall be recovered from the bill of the original executing agency. (point 2)
2. The garbage/ solid wastes collected from different places shall have to be loaded into transporting vehicle and to be transported to the approved to the approved dumping yards. The agency shall have to provide vehicle and labourers as per requirement. For any deviation Municipal authority/ sanitary Inspector may engage number of vehicles and labourers as per requirement and the cost shall be recovered from the monthly bill of the original agency in no case Garbage/ Solid wastes generated in a day shall be retained in the area for more than 24 hours. (Point-3)

During the checking of the vouchers w.r.t. accountant cash book it reveals that a sum of Rs. 20,000.00 was shown as paid to Mangaraj Behera towards cleaning of Main Drain from AkhayaMatha to Back side of BasuSahu House in ward No. 1 & 5. The said work was measured and recorded in the MB NO. 367 at page No. 44 to 45. Out the Rs. 20,000.00, deduction was made Rs. 1286.00 towards SD, IT & Labour Cess and RS.18714.00 shown as net payment.

It is to mention here that there are 19 wards in the Municipality out of which 18 wards (except ward No. 4) cleaning works executed by two Nos. of outsourced man power services. As per the agreement mentioned above, it is the prime responsibility of the executing agency to clean the drain. If the same work was executed by the municipality, why the expenditure money was not deducted from the bills of the executing agency may kindly be intimated to audit.

Payment was released as per the certification of the Sanitary Inspector. It is further to mention here that no correspondence was also made with the Manpower Service providers for cleaning of this drain. Hence, the work shown executed by the municipality instead of Service Providers is not admitted by audit.

Besides this, it is the duty and responsibility of the Sanitary Inspector to supervise the work of cleaning & sanitation and the Sanitary Inspector fails to discharge his duty properly. Hence it needs recovery from Sri Asit Das, SI.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

Sno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Asit Das	Sanitary Inspector	at. Choudwar Municipality Po. Choudwar Dist. Cuttack	18714

14.31 - EXCESS EXPENDITURE SHOWN THAN THE GRANT RECEIPT TOWARDS PAYMENT OF REMUNERATION TO BLO: - (OSP 123-124)

During the course of audit of vouchers w.r.t. accountant cash book it reveals that a sum of Rs. 1,29,500.00 was shown as receipt towards remuneration to BLO vide order No. 5403 Dt. 7.6.2019. Against such receipt Rs. 269900.00 shown as expenditure the details of which are given below. Objection memo was issued to clarify the same.

PARTICULARS	VR. No. & Date	Amount
Election (Remuneration paid to BLO)	26/03-04-2019	129500.00
Election (Remuneration paid to BLO)	170/21.6.2019	133000.00
Election (Remuneration paid to BLO)	758/2.1.2020	7400.00
TOTAL		269900.00

No compliance received till close of audit Hence, till final compliance / recoupment of the grant Rs. 140400.00 is held under objection.

14.32 - INADMISSIBLE EXPENDITURE TOWARDS REPAIR OF STREET LIGHT: - (OS 126)

On checking of the vouchers w.r.t accountant cash book it reveals that street light repair work was executed by the Municipality. It is to mention here that, new installation including day to day repair and maintenance of street light in municipality area has been handed over to EESL on out sourcing basis as per the agreement executed between Executive Officer, Choudwar Municipality and EESL company on 3.8.2017. As per previous year audit report Para No 18.4, the EESL taken up the work w.e.f. March '2018. Hence, it needs clarification why the repair work was taken up by the Municipality. Besides this, in the following cases work shown executed by the Vehicle (haiwa) OR-02-AB-8483 which is a Hero Honda. Hence objection memo was issue to clarify, why the said work shall not be treated as false. The details are furnished below.

PARTICULARS	VR. No. & date	Amount
Installation of 5 Nos. of pol by using vehicle OR-02-AB-8483	554/11.10.2019	10266.00
Repair & maintenance of Highmax by using vehicle OR-02AB-8483	67/64.12.2019	6400.00
2 Nos Semihigh Mast light in ward NO. 15 & 16 by vehicle No. OR-02-AB-8483	793/7.1.2020	6400.00
Total		23066.00

No compliance received till close of audit. As the repair work was shown as executed by using false vehicle, the expenditure can not be admitted in audit and Rs. 23066.00 is needs recovery from the following official(s).

Responsible Person for this paragraph

SIno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	SK. Rajuddin	Jr. Asst.	at Choudwar Municipality, Choudwar, District- Cuttack	11533
2	Satyabrata Mantri	EO	at.Sambalpur Municipal corporation	5133

			Po. Sambalpur Dist.Cuttack	
3	Pabitra kumar Behera	EO	at. Choudwar Municipality Po. Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	6400

14.33 - ENGAGEMENT OF EMPLOYEES THROUGH OUTSOURCE WITHOUT SPECIFIC WORK:- (OSP 126 to 127)

During checking of the vouchers w.r.t. accountant cash book it reveals the following employees were engaged without any specific reasons which needs clarification.

NAME OF THE STAFF	DESIGNTION	REMARKS OF THE AUDIT
Logesh Das	Mulia	These 8 Nos. of employees working as Electricians in this Municipality. It is to mention here that, new installation including day to day repair and maintenance of street light in the municipal area has been hand over o the EESL on out sourcing basis as per the agreement executed between E.O. & EESL company w.e.f. 3.8.2018. After that they have no specific work to do in the Municipality. They attached to Electric Section and work in all section as an when required. The rate of payment was changed from skilled to unskilled and the service was continued. From this it is clear that these surplus staffs were used as and when required by all sections.
Rabindra Barik	Mulia	
Siba Nayak	Mulia	
Sk. Budhan	Mulia	
Pradeep Ku. Samal	Mulia	
Prahallad Ku. Sahoo	Mulia	
Rashmi Ranjan Das	Line man	
Manasranjan Behera	Line man	
Sibananda Sahoo	Pharmacist	There is no dispensary in the Municipality. There is no any medical related programme conducted by the Municipality. A pharmacist was outsourced and attached to Tax section.
Paban Ku. Swain	Tractor Driver	There are two Nos. of vehicles were available in the Municipality. One is Ambassador (OR-05-AR-8281) and another is Office Tractor (OR-05T-5673). For these two vehicles, there are two drivers (Sk. Kamal Mustafa, Regular driver & Tikam Sahu, W.C. Tractor Driver) are working in the municipality in regular establishment. <i>It is further to mention here that the municipal CESS POLL vehicle was last run</i>

		on 26.08.2017. Hence, without any reasons Paban Ku. Swain was engaged as Tractor Driver through Outsource service without any requirement. .
Deepak Ku. Behera	Park Labour	Whether there is any park under the maintenance of the Municipality? No expenditure was incurred by the municipality for day to day expenditure of the park like purchase of plant, seeds, watering, purchase of fertilizer, cutter etc. In support of this documentary evidence may kindly be produced before audit to justify the appointment of 2 Nos. of gardener/ Park labour.
DasarathiBeura	Gardener	

Form the above table audit comes to following conclusions,

1. Electricians (8 Nos.):-

Engagement of 8 Nos. electricians was continued when new installation including day to day repair and maintenance of street light in the municipal area has been hand over o the EESL on out sourcing basis as per the agreement executed between E.O. & EESL company w.e.f. 3.8.2018. Their engagement was continued and shown as worked in different section as and when required. Engagement without any urgency purpose can not be admitted in audit and the wages paid for the same was also not admitted in audit.

2. Pharmacist

Engagement of pharmacist through outsource without any dispensary and attached his service in Tax section is not admitted in audit.

3. Tractor Driver

Engaged through outsources without vehicle is not admitted in audit.

4. Gardner & park labour (2 Nos.)

Local authority fails to produce the documentary evidence regarding having garden. Hence, engagement of 2Nos. of Gardner without any garden can not be admissible in audit.

Hence, the amount of Rs. **1964365.00 paid** towards wages/ remuneration for the above purpose is treated as wasteful expenditure. The details are furnished below.

MONTH	DRIVER	PHARMASIST	Electricians (8 Nos.)	Gardner (2 Nos.)	TOTAL	VR. No. & date
Jan-19	11739.29	11739.29	77398	18523.5455	119400.12	80/14.5.19
Feb-19	10434.92	10434.92	68798	16465.37377	106133.22	
Mar-19	11304.50	0.00	74531	17837.48826	103672.99	
Apr-19	11304.50	22609.00	74531	17837.48826	126281.98	132/12-06-2019

May-19	3913.10	11739.29	77398	18523.5455	111573.93	267/02-08-2019
Jun-19	0.00	16681.16	87569	21892.35265	126142.51	
Arrear Nov to March-19	24285.41	19390.67	60918	19128.25226	123722.33	
Arrear April to May-19	6873.97	15515.54	28488	9064.2812	59941.79	
Jul-19	0.00	17787.34	93376	23344.099	134507.44	565/14-10-2019
Aug-19	0.00	17787.34	93376	23344.099	134507.44	
Sep-19	11199.44	16469.76	86460	21614.90648	135744.10	679/04-12-2019
Oct-19	16247.70	16247.70	84830	21323.48085	138648.89	678/4.12.2019
Nov-19	15645.94	15645.94	81688	20533.7223	133513.59	752/1.1.2020
Dec-19	15645.94	15645.94	81688	20533.7223	133513.59	863/18.1.2020
Jan-20	16683.41	16683.41	88297	22194.891	143858.71	930/13.2.2020
Feb-20	15447.60	15447.60	81756	20550.825	133202.03	989/18.3.2020
TOTAL	170725.70	239824.88	1241102.00	312712.07	1964364.66	

No compliance received till close of audit. For the above wasteful expenditure, the following official(s) are found responsible.(responsible was fixed on the basis of engagement period).

Responsible Person for this paragraph

S/no	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Satyabrata Mantri	EO	at.Sambalpur Municipal corporation Po. Sambalpur Dist.Cuttack	1420277
2	Pabitra kumar Behera	EO	at. Choudwar Municipality Po. Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	544088

14.34 - EXCESS RATE ALLOWED THAN THE ADMISSIBLE: - (OSP 128 to 130)

Labour and ESI Department Notification No. The 28th April 2007 S.R.O. No. 269/2007& Notification No. The 15th December,2018, SRO No. 472 Dt. 2018, rates of wages payable to the Unskilled, Semi-skilled, Skilled, highly skilled categories of employees employed in Local Authority in the whole State of Orissa was categorised according to the nature of work. As per the above Notifications, category and nature of work was classified below.

Category of wages	Nature of work
Skilled	DEO
Skilled	Pharmacist
Skilled	Tractor Driver
Semi-Skilled	Work Sarkar

But on checking of the bills of the Man power providers, the rate of High Skilled wages was allowed to DEO, Pharmacist, Tractor Driver and Skilled wages to Work Sarkar by violating the above notification which is not

admitted in audit and clarification was sought through the objection memo. The details of excess payment calculation were furnished below.

	NAME OF THE PERSON	Designation	Rate paid	Rate admissible	No. of days	Excess paid	Service Charge	EPF	ESI	GST	TOTAL
1/2019 to 3/19											
1	Jyotsnarani Behera	DEO	430.00	370.00	77	4620	438.9	628.782	196.35	910.602	6794.634
2	SradhanjaliParija	DEO	430.00	370.00	77	4620	438.9	628.782	196.35	910.602	6794.634
3	Sibananda Sahoo	Pharmacist	430.00	370.00	51	3060	290.7	416.466	130.05	603.126	4500.342
4	Paban Ku. Swain	Tractor Driver	430.00	370.00	77	4620	438.9	628.782	196.35	910.602	6794.634
5	Debdas Panda	Work Sarkar	370.00	320.00	77	3850	365.75	523.985	163.625	758.835	5662.195
6	Ajaya Kumar Nayak	Work Sarkar	370.00	320.00	77	3850	365.75	523.985	163.625	758.835	5662.195
	Ratikanta Swain	DEO									
4/19 to 9/19											
1	Jyotsnarani Behera	DEO	436.30	376.30	157	9420.00	894.90	1282.06	400.35	1856.68	13853.99
2	SradhanjaliParija	DEO	436.30	376.30	157	9420.00	894.90	1282.06	400.35	1856.68	13853.99
3	Sibananda Sahoo	Pharmacist	436.30	376.30	183	10980.00	1043.10	1494.38	466.65	2164.16	16148.29
4	Paban Ku. Swain	Tractor Driver	436.30	376.30	52	3120.00	296.40	424.63	132.60	614.95	4588.58
5	Debdas Panda	Work Sarkar	376.30	326.30	157	7850.00	745.75	1068.39	333.63	1547.24	11545.00
6	Ajaya Kumar Nayak	Work Sarkar	376.30	326.30	157	7850.00	745.75	1068.39	333.63	1547.24	11545.00
	Ratikanta Swain	DEO									
10/19 to 11/19											

1	Jyotsna rani Behera	DEO	436.30	376.30	53	3180.00	270.30	413.40	95.40	621.05	4580.15
2	SradhanjaliParija	DEO	436.30	376.30	53	3180.00	270.30	413.40	95.40	621.05	4580.15
3	Sibananda Sahoo	Pharmacist	436.30	376.30	53	3180.00	270.30	413.40	95.40	621.05	4580.15
4	Paban Ku. Swain	Tractor Driver	436.30	376.30	53	3180.00	270.30	413.40	95.40	621.05	4580.15
5	Debdas Panda	Work Sarkar	376.30	326.30	53	2650.00	225.25	344.50	79.50	517.55	3816.80
6	Ajaya Kumar Nayak	Work Sarkar	376.30	326.30	53	2650.00	225.25	344.50	79.50	517.55	3816.80
	Ratikanta Swain	DEO				0	0	0	0	0	0
12/19 to 2/20											
1	Jyotsna rani Behera	DEO	448.00	388.00	78	4680.00	397.80	608.40	140.40	914.00	6740.60
2	SradhanjaliParija	DEO	448.00	388.00	78	4680.00	397.80	608.40	140.40	914.00	6740.60
3	Sibananda Sahoo	Pharmacist	448.00	388.00	78	4680.00	397.80	608.40	140.40	914.00	6740.60
4	Paban Ku. Swain	Tractor Driver	448.00	388.00	78	4680.00	397.80	608.40	140.40	914.00	6740.60
5	Debdas Panda	Work Sarkar	388.00	338.00	78	3900.00	331.50	507.00	117.00	761.67	5617.17
6	Ajaya Kumar Nayak	Work Sarkar	388.00	338.00	78	3900.00	331.50	507.00	117.00	761.67	5617.17
	Ratikanta Swain	DEO	448.00	388.00	52	3120.00	265.20	405.60	93.60	609.34	4493.74

Persons wise excess payment abstract was given below.

Jyotsnarani Behera	DEO	31969.39
SradhanjaliParija	DEO	31969.39
Sibananda Sahoo	Pharmacist	31969.39
Paban Ku. Swain	Tractor Driver	22703.98
Debdas Panda	Work Sarkar	26641.16
Ajaya Kumar Nayak	Work Sarkar	26641.16

Ratikanta Swain	DEO	4493.74
TOTAL		176388.2

No compliance received till close of audit. Steps may be taken to effect recovery from the concerned employees failing for the above excess expenditure, the following officials are found responsible.

It is to mention here that excess payment relates to Sri Sibananda Sahoo, Pharmacist & Sri Paban Ku. Swain, Tractor Driver has been dealt in para No. 14.33. Hence the balance amount of Rs. 121715.00 (176388.00 - 31696.00 -22704.00) was suggested for recovery in the para.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

S/no	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Debasis Mahapatra	Jr. Asst.	at Choudwar Municipality, Choudwar, District- Cuttack	60857
2	Satyabrata Mantri	EO	at.Sambalpur Municipal corporation Po. Sambalpur Dist.Cuttack	37857
3	Pabitra kumar Behera	EO	at. Choudwar Municipality Po. Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	23001

14.35 - Loss of Govt. revenue due to non collection of GST on Kalyan Mandap & Town hall rent (OSP 93)

On checking the Collection register of Kalyani Mandap, it revealed that an amount of Rs.744500.00 collected towards rent from 2Nos. Kalyani Mandap & one Town hall. GST on booking of kalyan Mandap is 18%. Objection memo was issued to clarify, whether the amount collected from Kalyani Mandap is included GST or excluding GST. In response to objection memo no reply was furnished by the local authority. It is to mention here that, as per the Money receipt amount was collected towards charges of the Kalyan Mandap. No amount was also deposited in the proper head of account towards GST. Hence, it is clear that, the amount collected only towards Kalyan Mandap charges.

In response to objection memo local authority replied that "Henceforth the GST collected from the Kalyan Mandap will be deposited"

The reply fails to settle the objection. From the reply it is not clear that whether GST was collected or not.

Hence, due to non collection/ deposit of the GST, Govt. sustained loss RS. 134,010.00 (Rs. 744500.00x 18%). Hence, Rs. 134010.00 is held under objection till the final compliance by the local authority. .

14.36 - Inadmissible expenditure from PDS fund (OSP 30)

On scrutiny the PDS cash book with pass book, it was seen an air condition is purchased from PDS fund to install the PDS section. Further scrutiny, it was seen that an old air condition was replaced Rs.1500/- and purchased new A.C Rs.30800.00 (32300-1500) vide vno.18/26.7.2019 from Patra Electronics, Cuttack .after reduction of exchange price Rs.1500.00. Objection memo was issued to produce the Govt. guideline regarding admissibility of

purchase of AC out of PDS fund.

In response to objection memo local authority replied that " on request of the Supplies Inspector, the Executive Officer has ordered to purchase A/c for PDS Section. At that time Municipal Fund not available for purchase of A/c. So the EO ordered to pay from PDS fund So the Memo may kindly be dropped"

It is to mention here that the reply of the local authority is not at all acceptable due to the following reasons.

1. Documents in support of order of the Executive Officer and documents relating to non availability of the Municipal fund is not produced before audit to establish the reply.
2. The fund utilised fund was not yet recouped from the Municipal fund
3. Reasons for purchase of new AC by exchanging a old AC instead of repairing the old one was not explained.
4. Govt. guideline for utilisation of PDS fund for purchase of AC is not produced.
5. There is no Budgetary provision by the ULB for purchase of AC for PDS section.

Hence, the expenditure shown towards purchase of A.C. without guideline & sanction is not admissible in audit and Rs. 30800.00 is suggested for recovery from Sri Jhulendra Kumar Nayak, TC, Sales centre supervisor found responsible for this.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

S/no	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Jhulendra Kumar Nayak	TC	at-Choudwar Municipality, Choudwar, Cuttack	30800

14.37 - Excess Transportation charges

On scrutiny of the sales register, it seen that, kerosin oil is purchased from dealer M/s. Tulsidas Modi, Jagatpur. M/s Modi charge sale price with 5% GST and Transportation charges from depo to municipality office godown @ 0.30 per lts from starting point to 20 km radius. It is to mention here that, all the sell centers of the municipality are within the 20km radius from the depo. During 2019-20 financial year an amount of Rs.45281.00 has been paid to M/s Modi for transportation charges k.oil.

On further verification of the vouchers w.r.t. cash book it reveals that a sum of Rs.144155.00 was shown as expenditure towards transportation charges of Koil from Municipality Gown to Sales centre. If the purchased Koil directly transported to the sales centers instead of transported to central godown, the municipality could have been saved Rs. 144155.00. Hence, objection memo was issued to clarify, why the expenditure shown towards transportation to sales center from central center shall not be treated as loss to the municipality fund.

In response to objection memo local authority fails to return the original memo with due compliance. Hence, till the final compliance Rs. 144155.00 is held under objection.

14.38 - PRODUCTION THE METHOD OF SELECTIONS BENEFICIARIES OF SWACHHA BHARAT MISSION (OSP 48)

On checking the SBM cash book with pass book it was seen that an amount of Rs.1210359,00 paid to the beneficiaries for construction of latrine at their house to avoid open defecations. The expenditure detailed are given below. The method of selection the beneficiaries of IHHL and whether proper checking was made or not the house of beneficiaries to fit for get the latrine and related other documents in support of such expenditure.

Vrno/date	Chno/dt	amount	No of beneficiaries	Remarks
1/11.6.19	002445/11.6.19	114067.00	21	ICICI BANK
3/1.7.19	002447/2.7.19	143101.00	34	DO
7/13.8.19	002451/14.8.19	190302.00	39	DO
11/24.9.19	002455/1.10.19	240302.00	47	DO
22/2.1.20	NEFT	39200.00	7	DO
25/27.2.20	002472/4.3.20	287567.00	57	DO
	TOTAL	1210359.00		

Till the close of audit, local authority fails to produce the related documents before audit. Hence till the production of the same RS. 1210359.00 is held under objection.

14.39 - INADMISSIBLE ADJUSTMENT OF ADVANCE: - (osp 119)

On checking of the vouchers w.r.t. accountant cash book it reveals that Rs. 50000.00 was given as advance to Tapan Kumar Sahoo for expenditure incurred on the eve of Republic Day 2020 which was adjusted vide Vr. No. 1033 Dt. 30.3.2020. On scrutiny of the vouchers, it reveals that the bills produced for adjustment of advance after the occasion happened i.e. after 26.1.2020 which is not admitted in audit and needs clarification as the bills/ cash bills were generated on the date of purchase. Hence objection memo was issued to clarify how the purchase goods were utilised on Republic Day 2020.

BILL no.	DATE	NAME OF THE FIRM	PURPOSE OF THE BILL	AMOUNT
32	10.02.2020	Chacha-G-Graphics	Cloth Banner	3920.00
30	30.1.2020	Baba Chateswar Tiffin Centre	350 Pkts. Of tiffin	7500.00
292	28.1.2020	Maa Tarini Puspalaya	Garlands	3800.00
15	29.1.2020	Sahoo Namkin	Seu & Ladu	18200.00
760	28.1.2020	Pratyush Graphics	Printing of Invitation	4800.00
Total				38220.00

In response to objection memo local authority fails to furnish any reply in this regard. Materials purchased after the celebration day and shown as utilised in the days of celebration is not admitted in audit and Rs 38220.00 needs recovery from the following official against whom the advance was adjusted.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

S/no	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Tapan kumar sahu	Jamadar	at.Choudwar Municipality po. Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	38220

--	--	--	--	--

14.40 - INADMISSIBLE EXPENDITURE SHOWN FOR CONSTRUCTION OF REST SHEED (OSP 119)

The GST council has fitted over 1300 goods and 500 services under four tax slabs of 5%, 12%, 18% and 28% under GST. This is aside the tax on gold that is kept at 3% and rough precious and semi-precious stones that are placed at a special rate of 0.25% under GST. 7% goods and services fall under this category.

On checking of the vouchers w.r.t. accountant cash book it reveals that a sum of RS. 30,833.00 was shown as expenditure towards construction of restsheed for the purpose of Republic Day-2020 and the payment was made to Mangaraj Behera vide Ch. NO. 552049 vide Vr. No. 1032 DT. 30.3.2020. On checking of the bill it reveals that the bill was prepared by making a print on the letter pad where the GST No. was mentioned 21AMQPB5223N3Z1. Further it is to mention here that Bill amount was 26580.00 and Rs. 4252.00 charged as GST @ 16% (CGST 8% & SGST 8%) of the bill. There is no such GST slab (16%) by the GST council. Hence, it is clear that a false bill was prepared in the letter pad without bill No. or invoice No. and GST charged outside the slab fitted by the GST council, which is not admitted in audit.

In response to objection memo local authority furnished no reply till the close of audit. Hence, objection stands and Rs. 30833.00 needs recovery from the following officials. .

Responsible Person for this paragraph

SIno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Debasis Panda	Accountant	at. Choudwar Municipality Po.Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	15417
2	Pabitra kumar Behera	EO	at. Choudwar Municipality Po. Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	15416

14.41 - EXCESS PAYMENT MADE BY MAKING MANIPULATION OF BILL:- (OSP 15)

On Checking of the vouchers w.r.t. accountant cash book it reveals that a sum of Rs 52500.00 was shown as expenditure vide vr. No. 34 Dt. 6.4.2019 against the original bill of Rs. 51500.00 resulted excess payment of Rs. 1000.00 for which clarification was sought through the objection memo. The details are furnished below.

Name of the firm	Bill No.	Qty. purchased (Qtl.)	BILL BEFORE MANUPULATION					BILL AFTER MANUPULATION					Excess paid
			Price per Unit	Unit value	CGST	SGST	Total	Price per Unit	Unit value	CGST	SGST	Total	
Biraja Chemicals	219/11.12.18	20	952.39	19047.80	476.20	476.20	20000	1000	20000	500	500	21000	1000
	273/16.3.19	30	1000	30000.00	750.00	750.00	31500.00	1000	30000.00	750.00	750.00	31500.00	0

Total	50	1952.39	49047.8	1226.195	1226.195	51500	2000	50000	1250	1250	52500	1000
-------	----	---------	---------	----------	----------	-------	------	-------	------	------	-------	------

In response to objection memo reply received till close of audit. Payment to the shop keeper by manipulating the bill is not admissible in audit and needs recovery from the following officials.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

Slno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Satyabrata Mantri	EO	at.Sambalpur Municipal corporation Po. Sambalpur Dist.Cuttack	500
2	Asit Das	Sanitary Inspector	at. Choudwar Municipality Po. Choudwar Dist. Cuttack	500

PARA: 15 AUDIT ON WORKS

15.1 - Excess expenditure due to allowing inadmissible proportion in CC work (osp 94 & 95)

Name of the work	Repair of Road from Mani Bazar Main road to Labour in work no. 10
Name of the Contractor	Sri Krushna Ch. Behera
Voucher No.	1025/24.3.2020
MB No. & Page No.	MB NO. 369/176 to 180
Name of the JE	Champak Pradhan
Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra
Rate of tender	Less 14.99

On checking of the cash record w.r.t. MB it reveals that repair work of the Mani bazar Main road was executed and recorded in the above MB.

It is to point out here that, before doing repair work no premeasurement was made by the technical person of the Municipality. Besides this, allegation was received regarding low quality work in this project. Hence it needs clarification, why the payment was allowed as per the statement of the local people instead of enquiry by the higher technical person.

Besides this, in this work repair work was executed on wearing coat of the Road. As per guide line issued by Lr. No. 5473/HUD Dt. 7.2.2013. As per this letter **“Construction of un-reinforced is to be made in plane cement concrete pavement with 43 grade cement with M20 grade mix and compacting with suitable vibrator all complete and filling the construction joints with bitumen.”**

But on checking of the case record it reveals that work was executed in the proportion CC (1:2:4) instead of M20 mix by violating the Govt. order resulted loss of Municipal fund of Rs.136156.00 for which clarification was sought through the objection memo. The calculation of M20 grade mix & loss of municipal fund is furnished below.

Calculation of rate of RCCM20:-

Cement concrete M 20 for RCC Work using 20mm down graded size hard granite c.b chips etc. complete per 1 cum.						
Data for 15 Cum.						
Labours.						
Mason 2nd. Class	1.50	Nos. @Rs.	370.00	/each	Rs.	555.00
Mate	0.86	Nos. @Rs.	320.00	/each	Rs.	275.20
Man Mulia	20.00	Nos. @Rs.	280.00	/each	Rs.	5600.00
Materials.						
20 mm H.G.C.B Chips	8.10	Cum@Rs.	1000.00	/Cum	Rs.	8100.00
10 mm H.G.C.B Chips	5.40	Cum@Rs.	1071.43	/Cum	Rs.	5785.72
Sand	6.75	Cum@Rs.	48.57	/Cum	Rs.	327.85
Cement	52.10	Qtl @Rs.	484.36	/Qtl.	Rs.	25235.16
Concrete Mixture	6.00	Per Hr.	153.91	/Hr.	Rs.	923.46
Generator 33 KVA	6.00	Per Hr.	208.70	/Hr.	Rs.	1252.20
				Total:	Rs.	48054.59
over head charges 15%						7208.19
20 mm H.G.C.B Chips	8.10		700.55			5674.455
10 mm H.G.C.B Chips	5.40		700.55			3782.97
Sand	6.75		228.67			1543.523
Cement	52.10		16.17			842.457
Total						67106.18
Labour Cess 1%						671.0618
Rate per 15 cum						67777.24
Rate per cum						4518.483

CALCULATION OF EXCESS PAYMENT: -

QUANTITY OF WORK	RATE ADMISSIBLE IN M20	RATE PAID IN CC (1:2:4)	INADMISSIBLE PAYMENT	Rate of Tender	Net loss
159.86	4518.48	5520.39	160165.3	14.99 Less	136156.549

In response to objection memo local authority replied that "specification is a part of power of technical person who has technically sanctioned the estimate & power given by Govt. Any technical specification of the item will be decided by the technical person according to the site condition, design and availability of material etc. Hence the para may be dropped."

The reply of the local authority is not admitted in audit due to the following reasons.

1. Any model estimate issued by the Govt. has to followed. There is no any order was produced by the local authority that, the power was given by the Govt. to the technical person to finalise the specification by violating the Govt. Guideline.
2. No specific reasons was given / mention in the case record like the site condition for deviation of the specification given by the Govt.
3. Question of Non availability of the material does not arise because building works were executed by this ULB in RCC M20 specification.
4. RCC M20 is equal strength of RCC (1:1.5:3) which has more strength than the RCC (1:2:4) in less expenditure as compressive strength of the RCC M20 is 20MPa where as compressive strength of the RCC (1:2:4) is MPa 15. If the site condition is bad, Choosing a lower strength proportion in higher rate is not acceptable in audit.
5. As per clause 3 of the above letter " Deviation, if any, felt necessary on account of local variations should be brought to the notice of the department". In support of such no documents were produced before audit.

Hence inadmissible & wasteful expenditure of RS. 136157.00 needs recovery from the Junior Engineer who prepared the estimate and the Asst. Engineer who technically sanction the project by violating the above guideline.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

Sln0	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Mahesh Prasad Mishra	Asst. Engineer	Choudwar, District- Cuttack	68079
2	Champak kumar Pradhan	JE	at. Choudwar Municipality po.Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	68078

15.2 - Excess expenditure due to erroneous measurement (OSP 95-97)

Name of the work	Construction of Cement Concrete Road and Drain from Abhaya Behera house to Banu Sahu house
Name of the Contractor	Sri Samarajit Dalai
Voucher No.	409 Dt. 12.9.2019
MB No. & Page No.	MB Page No. 337 P131 to 135 & MB No. 363 P.185 to 197
Name of the JE	Champak Pradhan
Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra
Scheme	Unnati
EC	Rs. 750000.00

On checking of the above case record w.r.t. MB it reveals that above work was execute and recorded in the above

MB. On checking of the MB w.r.t. case record the following irregularities were noticed.

1. Excess payment due to erroneous measurement: -

During checking, audit observed that by showing excess height measurement in walls undue financial benefit was allowed the executant as detailed below.

SL. No.	PARTICULARS OF WORK	Height	Remarks
1	Earth work	0.75	Item NO. 1 P. 131
2	Sand filling	0.05	Item No. 2 P. 132
3	CC (1:4:8)	0.1	Item No. 3 p. 132
4	M20 (Drain base)	0.1	Item No. 1 P. 134
5	Admissible height for drain wall (1-(2+3+4))	0.5	
6	Wall height shown	0.6	Item No. 1 P 134
7	Excess height shown (6-5)	0.1	

Calculation of excess payment: $-2 \times 30 \times 0.20 \times 0.10 = 1.2$ cum @ 4819.87 = **5784.00**

Besides above on checking of the MB NO. 363 Page No 185 to 197 and estimate it reveals that agreement was made for construction of 180 Mtrs. Long drain along with 108.70 mtr. length road. But on checking of the MB, it reveals that only 200.82 mtr. (106.4 mtr. + 94.42 mtr) length drain work along with 15.3mtr. length road repair work was made by violating the agreement. Further, it is to mention here that when agreement was made for construction of 0.75mtr. width drain and 0.15 mtr. width drain wall. But execution was made for 0.80 mtr width drain and 0.20 mtr. width drain wall without any permission from the proper authority. Besides this the height of the bed of the drain was executed 0.10 mtr. by violating the Govt. Guideline which is not admissible in audit. The differential cost is furnished below.

RCC M20 (DRAIN BED)								EXCESS QTY.	RATE	AMOUNT
L	B	H	QTY.	L	B	H	QTY.			
3.45	0.8	0.1	0.276	3.45	0.75	0.075	0.194063	3.620875	4819.87	17452.00
11.55	0.8	0.1	0.924	11.55	0.75	0.075	0.649688			
5.2	0.8	0.1	0.416	5.2	0.75	0.075	0.2925			
5.3	0.8	0.1	0.424	5.3	0.75	0.075	0.298125			
14.95	1	0.1	1.495	14.95	0.75	0.075	0.840938			
15	1	0.1	1.5	15	0.75	0.075	0.84375			
15	1	0.1	1.5	15	0.75	0.075	0.84375			
6.8	1	0.1	0.68	6.8	0.75	0.075	0.3825			
5.57	1	0.1	0.557	5.57	0.75	0.075	0.313313			
11.6	1	0.1	1.16	11.6	0.75	0.075	0.6525			
			8.932				5.311125			

RCC M20 (DRAIN WALL)												
No.	L	B	H	QTY.	No.	L	B	H	QTY.	EXCES S QTY.	RATE	INADM ISSIBL E EXPR.
2	3.45	0.20	0.46	0.63	2	3.45	0.15	0.46	0.48	4.18	4819.8 7	20134. 73
1	11.55	0.20	0.49	1.12	1	11.55	0.15	0.49	0.84			
1	11.55	0.17	0.61	1.20	1	11.55	0.15	0.61	1.06			
1	5.20	0.20	0.49	0.50	1	5.20	0.15	0.49	0.38			
1	5.20	0.17	0.60	0.53	1	5.20	0.15	0.60	0.47			
2	5.30	0.20	0.50	1.06	2	5.30	0.15	0.50	0.80			
1	4.95	0.20	0.45	0.45	1	4.95	0.15	0.45	0.33			
1	14.60	0.20	0.50	1.46	1	14.60	0.15	0.50	1.10			
1	15.00	0.20	0.49	1.47	1	15.00	0.15	0.49	1.10			
1	15.00	0.20	0.52	1.55	1	15.00	0.15	0.52	1.16			
1	15.00	0.20	0.57	1.70	1	15.00	0.15	0.57	1.27			
1	15.00	0.20	0.47	1.40	1	15.00	0.15	0.47	1.05			
1	6.80	0.20	0.45	0.61	1	6.80	0.15	0.45	0.46			
1	6.80	0.20	0.53	0.71	1	6.80	0.15	0.53	0.54			
2	5.57	0.20	0.46	1.02	2	5.57	0.15	0.46	0.77			
1	11.60	0.20	0.52	1.19	1	11.60	0.15	0.52	0.90			
1	11.60	0.20	0.44	1.02	1	11.60	0.15	0.44	0.77			
				17.624 67					13.45			

Hence in to a sum of **Rs.43371.00 (5784.00+17452.00+20135.00)** needs recovery.

However on issue of objection memo **Rs. 43371.00** was recovered vide **MR No. 79348 Dt. 19.5.2021 . The same was also taken to Cashiers cash book on 195.2021.** Hence objection was dropped.

15.3 - Excess payment due to adoption of in-proper proportion (OSP-98 to 100)

Name of the work	Construction of RCC drain inside the town hall premises on W. No. 8
Name of the Contractor	Sri Subash Ch. Barik
Voucher No.	Vr. No. 142/17.6.2019
MB No. & Page No.	MB No. 366 DT. 108 to 117
Name of the JE	Champak Pradhan
Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra

Rate of tender

Less 14.99

On checking of the cash record w.r.t. MB it reveals that Construction of RCC drain inside the town hall premises on W. No. 8 was executed and recorded in the above MB.

It is to point out here that, before doing repair work no premeasurement was made by the technical person of the Municipality. Besides this, allegation was received regarding low quality work in this project. Hence it needs clarification, why the payment was allowed as per the statement of the local people instead of enquiry by the higher technical person.

Besides this, in this work repair work was executed on wearing coat of the Road. As per guide line issued by Lr. No. 5473/HUD Dt. 7.2.2013. As per this letter **“Construction of un-reinforced is to be made in plane cement concrete pavement with 43 grade cement with M20 grade mix and compacting with suitable vibrator all complete and filling the construction joints with bitumen.”**

But on checking of the case record it reveals that work was executed in the proportion CC (1:2:4) instead of M20 mix by violating the Govt. order resulted loss of Municipal fund of Rs.11898.00 for which clarification clarification was sought through the objection memo. The calculation of M20 grade mix & loss of municipal fund is furnished below.

Calculation of rate of RCCM20

Cement concrete M 20 for RCC Work using 20mm down graded size hard granite c.b chips etc. complete per 1 cum.						
Data for 15 Cum.						
Labour						
Mason 2nd. Class	1.50	Nos. @Rs.	370.00	/each	Rs.	555.00
Mate	0.86	Nos. @Rs.	320.00	/each	Rs.	275.20
Man Mulia	20.00	Nos. @Rs.	280.00	/each	Rs.	5600.00
Materials.						
20 mm H.G.C.B Chips	8.10	Cum@Rs.	1000.00	/Cum	Rs.	8100.00
10 mm H.G.C.B Chips	5.40	Cum@Rs.	1071.43	/Cum	Rs.	5785.72
Sand	6.75	Cum@Rs.	48.57	/Cum	Rs.	327.85
Cement	52.10	Qtl @Rs.	484.36	/Qtl.	Rs.	25235.16
Concrete Mixture	6.00	Per Hr.	153.91	/Hr.	Rs.	923.46
Generator 33 KVA	6.00	Per Hr.	208.70	/Hr.	Rs.	1252.20
				Total:	Rs.	48054.59
over head charges 15%						7208.19
20 mm H.G.C.B Chips	8.10		700.55			5674.455
10 mm H.G.C.B Chips	5.40		700.55			3782.97

Sand	6.75		228.67			1543.523
Cement	52.10		16.17			842.457
Total						67106.18
Labour Cess 1%						671.0618
Rate per 15 cum						67777.24
Rate per cum						4518.483

Calculation of Excess payment: -

QUANTITY OF WORK	RATE ADMISSIBLE IN M20	RATE PAID IN CC (1:2:4)	INADMISSIBLE PAYMENT	Rate of Tender	Net loss
9.5	4518.48	6003.00	14102.94	14.99 less	11989.00

However, on issue of objection memo RS. 11989.00 was recovered vide MR. No. 79340 DT. 19.05.2021. The same was also taken to Cashiers Cash Book on 19.5.201. Hence objection raised by audit is dropped.

15.4 - Excess payment due to erroneous calculation (OSP-100-101)

Name of the work	Construction of Parida Sahi Community centre at parida sahi in workd No. 3
Name of the Contractor	Sri Susanta Ku. Behera
Voucher No.	146/17.6.19
MB No. & Page No.	MB No. 365 P. 41 to 74
Name of the JE	Champak Pradhan
Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra
Rate of tender	Less 14.99

1. Excess payment due to erroneous calculation: -

In item No. 5 at Page No.46 M.B. No. 365, R.C.C. M20 using 20mm and downgraded 20mm size chips, the measurement for execution of column base and columns consisting 5 Nos. are recorded out of which the measurement for pedestal is recorded as follows.

$$6\{((1.4 \times 1.4') + (0.38' \times 0.38'))/2\} \times 0.4 = 2.53 \text{ cum.}$$

It would be seen from the above measurement that the pedestal after column base has been executed in a frustum of pyramidal shape. Hence the volume of the pedestal should have been arrived at adopting the prescribed formula i.e. $(a^2 + b^2 + a^2b^2) h/3$ but the volume has been calculated by adopting an irrelevant formula i.e. $(a^2 + b^2)/2 \times h$. Due to such erroneous calculation a total sum of Rs. was paid in excess as calculated below which needs recovery.

$$(a^2 + b^2 + a^2b^2) h/3 = (1.4^2 + 0.38^2) + (1.4 \times 0.38)^2 \times 0.4/3 = 0.35 \text{ cum}$$

Hence qty. of 6 columns = $6 \times 0.35 = 2.1 \text{ cum}$

Excess: $2.53 - 2.1 = 0.43 \text{ cum @ } 4849.87 = \text{Rs.}2085.00$

2.Excess payment due to showing inadmissible work. -

On further checking it reveals that metaling work for floor in CC (1:4:8) was executed at item No 3 and recorded at page No. 45 of the MB Book and fixing of marble tiles in floors were executed and recorded vide item No. 10 at page No. 52. It is to mention here that in between the Floor work in CC (1:4:8) and Fixing of Marble tiles, CC (1:2:4) work was shown as executed vide item No. 8 at page No. 50 and Rs. 4968.35 (0.9 cum @ Rs. 5459.73) shown as expenditure which can not be admitted in audit.

Hence in toto a sum of Rs. 7053.00(2085.00 + 4968.00) needs recovery.

However on issue of objection memo Rs 7053.00 is recovered vide MR No. 79345 DT. 19.05.2021. The same was also taken to Cashiers Cash Book on 19.05.2021. Hence objection was dropped.

15.5 - Execution of inadmissible work (OSP 101 to 103)

Name of the work	Restoration of Tarini Temple located at HB colony, W. NO. 19
Name of the Contractor	Ajit Ku. Mohanty
Voucher No.	151/19.6.2019
MB No. & Page No.	MB No. 354 Page No. 83 to 89
Name of the JE	Subash Chandra Rout, JE, Tangi PS
Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra
Scheme	MLALAD
EC	Rs. 150000.00

Sanction order No. 2575 Dt. 12.11.2018, point No. 14, ***“No new construction of religious institutions is admissible, only repair & restoration of old religious places/ works constructed on authorized places are admissible.”***

Rule 6 and 7 of the scheme guidelines specify the projects which are admissible and inadmissible under the scheme respectively. A project/work shall be considered admissible if it benefits the public directly. Further, as per Annexure-IV (clarification/approval in respect of inadmissible projects), ***new construction like Church, Temple, Mosque, Club House, Yubak Sangha House, Ashram, Matha etc. under the banner of community centre and boundary wall of religious institutions were not admissible under the Scheme. (Vide Govt. order No. d13148/P DT. 13.09.2005)***

On checking of the above case record w.r.t. MB it reveals that Rs. 150000.00 was sanction vide Lr. No. 2575 Dt. 12.11.2018 for ***Restoration of Tarini Temple located at HB Colony, Word No. 19 of Choudwar Municipality.***

The above work was executed and recorded at MB No. 354 at page No. 83 to 89. On checking the executed items it reveals that there is no restoration work was done. Rather a MANDP was executed. The items of the works executed were furnished below.

1. Earth work for foundation. (Item No. 1 Page No. 83)
2. Sand filling in foundation and plinth. (Item No. 2 Page No. 84)
3. Laterite stone masonry in CM (1:6) in F & P (Item No. 3 Page No 86)
4. CC (1:3:6) in foundation and metaling in plinth. (Item No. 4 Page No. 86 to 87)
5. CC (1:2:4) over Metaling work of the Plinth. (Item No. 5 Page No. 87 & 88)

Besides this, it is observed from the Photographs kept in the file that, in the name plate written “Tarini Mandira ra

nirman (Construction of Tarini Temple).

From the above it is clear that new work was executed by violating the scheme guideline which needs clarification.

Besides this, it is to mention here that after execution of CC (1:3:6) for metaling of floor only 2.5 cm thick A.S. flooring in C.C (1:2:4) using 12 mm size h.g.c.b chips including punning etc is admissible which is to be measured in Sqm. But on checking of the measurement it is seen that CC(1:2:4) work was executed over the flooring work of CC(1:3:6) and measurement was taken in CUM which is not at all admissible in audit and needs clarification. The details are furnished below.

Calculation of rate of 2.5 cm thick A.S. flooring in C.C (1:2:4) using 12 mm size h.g.c.b chips including punning etc: -

2.5 cm thick A.S. flooring in C.C (1:2:4) using 12 mm size h.g.c.b chips including punning etc. complete per 1 sqm.						
Labours.						
Mason 1st. Class	0.13	Nos. @Rs.	436.30	/each	Rs.	56.72
Man Mulia	0.14	Nos. @Rs.	286.30	/each	Rs.	40.08
Women Mulia	0.22	Nos. @Rs.	286.30	/each	Rs.	62.99
Materials.						
12 mm H.G.C.B Chips	0.023	Cum@Rs.	1748.55	/Cum	Rs.	40.22
Sand	0.012	Cum@Rs.	277.24	/Cum	Rs.	3.33
Cement	0.0858	Qtl @Rs.	531.27	/Qtl.	Rs.	45.58
				Total:	Rs.	248.91
	Add 1% of Labour Charges				Rs.	2.49
				Total:	Rs.	251.40

Calculation of excess payment: -

PAID							EXCESS PAID
L	B	H	QTY.	RATE	PAID		
20.05	8.5	0.06	10.2255	5041.3	50362	8497.615	
1.95	2	0.06	0.234				
Total			9.9915				
ADMISSIBLE							
20.05	8.5		170.425	251.4	41864.39		
1.95	2		3.9				
			166.525				

Hence, till the compliance for construction Rs. 150000.00 is held under objection out of which Rs. 8498.00 is suggested for recovery.

However on issue of objection memo Rs. 8498.00 was recovered vide MR No. 79349 Dt. 19.05.2021. The same was also taken to Cashiers Cash Book in 19.05.2021. Hence objection was dropped But Rs. 1,50,000.00 is held under objection.

15.6 - Inadmissible expenditure in works (OSP 104 to 105)

Name of the work	Construction of Rest shed and Boundary wall of Chateswar Smasan in W. No. 2
Name of the Contractor	Sri Dillip Kumar Bhanja
Voucher No.	168/20.06.2019
MB No. & Page No.	MB No. 364/P 145-152 & MB No. 363 P. 152-158
Name of the JE	Champak Pradhan
Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra
Scheme	14th. CFC
EC	Rs. 454083.00

It is to mention here that after execution of CC (1:4:8) for metalling of floor (Item No. 3 Page No. 147) only 2.5 cm thick A.S. flooring in C.C (1:2:4) using 12 mm size h.g.c.b chips including punning etc is admissible which is to be measured in Sqm. But on checking of the measurement it is seen that CC(1:2:4) work was executed (Item No. 7 Page No 151) over the flooring work of CC(1:3:6) and measurement was taken in CUM which is not at all admissible in audit and needs clarification. The details are furnished below.

Calculation of rate of 2.5 cm thick A.S. flooring in C.C (1:2:4) using 12 mm size h.g.c.b chips including punning etc: -

2.5 cm thick A.S. flooring in C.C (1:2:4) using 12 mm size h.g.c.b chips including punning etc. complete per 1 sqm.						
Labours.						
Mason 1st. Class	0.13	Nos. @Rs.	436.30	/each	Rs.	56.72
Man Mulia	0.14	Nos. @Rs.	286.30	/each	Rs.	40.08
Women Mulia	0.22	Nos. @Rs.	286.30	/each	Rs.	62.99
Materials.						
12 mm H.G.C.B Chips	0.023	Cum@Rs.	1748.55	/Cum	Rs.	40.22
Sand	0.012	Cum@Rs.	277.24	/Cum	Rs.	3.33
Cement	0.0858	Qtl @Rs.	531.27	/Qtl.	Rs.	45.58
				Total:	Rs.	248.91
	Add 1% of Labour Charges				Rs.	2.49
				Total:	Rs.	251.40

Calculation of excess payment

PAID						EXCESS PAID (14.99%less)
L	B	H	QTY.	RATE	PAID	
9.4	4.4	0.075	3.102	5942.66	24665.01	7647.00
9.9	0.9	0.05	0.4455			

13.4	0.9	0.05	0.603		
Total			4.1505		
ADMISSIBLE					
9.4	4.4		41.36	251.4	15669.76
9.9	0.9		8.91		
13.4	0.9		12.06		
			62.33		

Hence Rs. 7647.00 is suggested for recovery.

However on issue of objection memo Rs. 7647.00 was recovered vide MR No. 79341 DT. 19.5.2021. The same was also taken to Cashiers Cash book on 19.5.2021. Hence objection was dropped.

15.7 - Payment towards inadmissible work (OSP 105)

Name of the work	Restoration of Gupteswar Mahadev Temple located at Gupteswar Sahi
Name of the Contractor	Soumya Ranjan Parida
Voucher No.	Vr. No. 271 Dt. 02-08-2019
MB No. & Page No.	MB No. 355 Page No. 40 to 48
Name of the JE	Subash Chandra Rout, JE, Tangi PS
Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra
Scheme	MLALAD
EC	Rs. 100000.00

On checking of the above case record w.r.t. MB it reveals that dismantling & removing of 25 cm thick AS flooring work was executed vide item No. 2 at Page No. 42 and Fixing tiles in floors work was executed in item No. 5 at page NO. 43. But on cross verification it reveals that CC (1:4:8) metaling work was shown as executed at Item No. 6 on the same area at page No. 45 & 46 for 2.44 cum @ 3324.99 and Rs. 8112.00 shown as expenditure without dismantling of previous /old metaling work which is not admitted in audit and objection memo was issued for clarification.

Hence, RS. 8112.00 needs recovery.

However, on issue of objection memo Rs. 8112.00 was recovered vide MR. No. 79350 Dt. 19.05.2021. The same was also reflected in the Cashiers Cash Book on 19.05.2021. Hence, objection was dropped.

15.8 - Execution of inadmissible project under MLALAD (Osp 106)

Name of the work	Completion of Jagannath CC located at W. No. 10
Name of the Contractor	Ajit Ku. Mohanty
Voucher No.	Vr. NO. 342/16.8.209
MB No. & Page No.	MB NO. 353 Page No 46 to 55

Name of the JE	Subash Chandra Rout, JE, Tangi PS
Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra
Scheme	MLALAD
EC	298466

Completion of Jagannath CC at W. No. 10 of CDR Municipality project was sanctioned vide Ir NO. 222/181.19 out of MLALAD interest money. Administrative approval of the project was made vide Lr. 194 DT. 26.2.2019. It is to mention here that out the above money a boundary wall along with CC work of the surrounding site/area were executed. On checking of the photo graphs kept in the file it is ascertained that the work was executed for a temple which was prohibited vide the Lr. NO. 7170/8.5.08 (boundary wall of religious institution). In the photographs the community centre was not covered which creates doubts. Hence, the EO of the municipality is requested to make a enquiry and report audit whether the boundary wall was executed for a religious institution or for the community centre. Documentary evidence may also be produced before audit for verification regarding construction of community centre. But, till the close of audit no documentary evidence was produced regarding construction of boundary wall of Jagannath CC located at W. No. 10. Hence, till the production of the same Rs. 298466.00 is held under objection.

15.9 - Execution of RCC work in inadmissible proportion (OSP 106 to 108)

Name of the work	Development of Chateswar Mandir of Choudwar Municipality
Name of the Contractor	Majoj Kumar Nayak
Voucher No.	Vr. No. 136/13.06.19
MB No. & Page No.	MB N. 368 P.1-27 & 28-33
Name of the JE	Champak Pradhan
Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra
Scheme	Tourism
EC	Rs. 1000000.00

It is to point out here that as per Analysis of Rates '2006 vide Item No.2 at page No.43 at Chapter IV it is mentioned that the RCC (1:1.5:3) is applicable specifically for minor repair work. The same was also clarified by the Works Department vide his Lr. No. 6/06-2710/W. Dt. 09.02.2007 in item No."vi". of the proceeding meeting of Codes Revision Committee held on 18.09.2006. As this building is a original work and allowing (1:1.5:3) proportion for RCC work nothing but allowing extra financial benefit to the executants which cannot be admitted in audit. For original RCC work M20 (In the designation of concrete mix, letter M refers to the Mix and the number to the specified characteristic compressive strength of 15cm. Cubes at 28 days)is admissible. It is further to mention her that as per Indian Standard Plain and Reinforced concrete Code of Practice (IS 456:2000) vide Para 6.1.3 it has been recommended that minimum grade of concrete shall not be less than M20 in reinforced concrete work and all reinforced concrete in the works shall be " design mix concrete" and there is no such mixing is recommended like RCC (1:1.5:3). For original RCC work M20 is admissible. Hence clarification was sought through objection memo why the differential cost shall not be suggested for recovery. The details are furnished below.

Cement concrete M 20 for RCC Work using 20mm down graded size hard granite c.b chips etc. complete per 1 cum.					
Data for 15 Cum.					
Labours.					

Mason 2nd. Class	1.50	Nos. @Rs.	240.00	/each	Rs.	360.00
Mate	0.86	Nos. @Rs.	220.00	/each	Rs.	189.20
Man Mulia	20.00	Nos. @Rs.	200.00	/each	Rs.	4000.00
Materials.						
20 mm H.G.C.B Chips	8.10	Cum@Rs.	1050.00	/Cum	Rs.	8505.00
10 mm H.G.C.B Chips	5.40	Cum@Rs.	1125.00	/Cum	Rs.	6075.00
Sand	6.75	Cum@Rs.	51.00	/Cum	Rs.	344.25
Cement	52.10	Qtl @Rs.	693.70	/Qtl.	Rs.	36141.77
Concrete Mixture	6.00	Per Hr.	177.00	/Hr.	Rs.	1062.00
Generator 33 KVA	6.00	Per Hr.	240.00	/Hr.	Rs.	1440.00
				Total:	Rs.	58117.22
over head charges 15%						8717.58
20 mm H.G.C.B Chips	8.10		734.69			5950.989
10 mm H.G.C.B Chips	5.40		734.69			3967.326
Sand	6.75		240.82			1625.535
Cement	52.10		16.90			880.49
Total						79259.14
Labour Cess 1%						792.5914
Rate per 15 cum						80051.73
Rate per cum						5336.782

Calculation of excess payment: -

QUANTITY OF WORK	RATE ADMISSIBLE IN M20	RATE PAID IN CC (1:2:4)	INADMISSIBLE PAYMENT	Rate of Tender	Net loss
47.9	5336.78	6742.83	67349.8	14.99 less	57254.0607

On issue of objection memo Rs. 51268.00 was recovered vide MR No. 79347 Dt. 19.05.2021 which was reflected in the Cashiers Cash Book on 19.05.201 leaving a balance of Rs. 5986.00 which needs recovery from the following official(s).

Responsible Person for this paragraph

S/no	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Champak kumar Pradhan	JE	at. Choudwar Municipality	2993

			po.Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	
2	Mahesh Prasad Mishra	Asst. Engineer	Choudwar, District- Cuttack	2993

15.10 - Inadmissible inclusion of GST in works bill (OSP 108-109)

Name of the work	Construction of Parking area & Gage of Kalyan Mandap at Gandhi Chhack
Name of the Contractor	Sri Mangaraj Behera
Voucher No.	Vr. No. 169 Dt. 20.6.2019
MB No. & Page No.	MB No. 341 P. 10 to 11 & MB No. 349 P. 53 to 60
Name of the JE	Pravat Kumar Sahoo, JE
Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra
Scheme	4th SFC, Devolution
EC	Rs. 990000.00

On checking of the above case record w.r.t. MB it reveals that estimate was prepared for the above work was made on 17.06.2017 for Rs. 841850.00 which is 14.99 less over CSR approved and the work order was issued in favour of Sri Mangaraj Behera vide Lr. No. 3701 Dt. 3.11.2017. It is further to mention here that the 1st. Running bill was paid amounting to Rs. 446946.00 vide Vr. No. 1255 Dt. 20.12.2017. No revised estimate was prepared, as the Estimate was prepared on the basis of pre-GST period. Due to non-revision of the Estimate, 12% GST was not added in the 1st. Running Bill. But during release/ payment of the 2nd running bill to a tune of Rs. 348596.00, GST 12% was added and total value of the work was derived RS. 390428 resulted excess payment as the estimate was prepared including VAT, Sales Tax, Excise Tax etc. The excess payment was calculated below.

Bill Amount	SGST 6%	CGST 6%	Total value of the bill	Excess paid
348596	20916	20916	390428	41832

However, on issue of objection memo local authority admitted the objection and Rs. 41832.00 was recovered vide MR No. 79339 Dt. 19.05.2021. Hence the objection was dropped.

15.11 - Payment towards inadmissible work (109-110)

Name of the work	Compleiton of Mahila community Centre at Gauda Sahi in Ward No. 18
Name of the Contractor	Jitendra Ku. Sahoo
Voucher No.	148/17.6.19
MB No. & Page No.	MB NO.364 P. 40 to 53
Name of the JE	Champak Pradhan
Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra
Scheme	Unnati
EC	Rs. 392542.00

On checking of the above case record w.r.t. MB it reveals flooring work of the above school was executed and recorded in the MB as detailed below.

L	B	H	QTY	RATE	AMOUNT	REMARKS
CC (1:4:8)						
4.9	3.9	0.1	1.911	3823.34	12725.9872	P. 42, Item No. 3
3.15	3.3	0.1	1.0395			
3.15	1.2	0.1	0.378			
CC (1:2:4)						
4.9	3.9	0.1	1.911	5459.73	18172.7113	P. 42 Item No. 5
3.15	3.3	0.1	1.0395			
3.15	1.2	0.1	0.378			
Fixing of vetrified tiles						
4.9	3.9		19.11	1001.92	33348.9072	P. 45, Item No. 8
3.15	3.3		10.395			
3.15	1.2		3.78			

From above it is clear that Flooring work was executed both in CC (1:3:6) and CC (1:2:4) and then vitrified tile fixing work was executed in 20mm thick cement mortar.

This is to mention here that vitrified tile work could be executed on CC (1:3:6). Hence objection memo issued to intimate the reasons for unnecessary execution of CC (1:2:4) and why the cost paid towards this should not be suggested for recovery from the persons find responsible for this as this is undue financial benefit to the executant.

In response to objection memo Rs. 18173.00 was recovered vide MR No. 79337Dt..19.05.2021. The same was also shown in the Cashiers Cash Book on 19.5.2012. Hence, the para was dropped.

15.12 - Payment towards inadmissible work (110-112)

Name of the work	Consstruction of Waiting shed at Chitreswar Burial Ground in ward No. 15
Name of the Contractor	Ritesh Ku. Jena
Voucher No.	Vr No. 931 Dt 18.2.20
MB No. & Page No.	MB No. 369 P. 137 to 145
Name of the JE	Champak Pradhan
Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra
Scheme	Unnati
EC	RS. 624952.00

Besides this, it is to mention here that after execution of CC (1:4:8) for metalling of floor (Item No. 3 Page No. 125) only 2.5 cm thick A.S. flooring in C.C (1:2:4) using 12 mm size h.g.c.b chips including punning etc is admissible which is to be measured in Sqm. But on checking of the measurement it is seen that CC(1:2:4) work was executed (Item No. 8 Page No 132) over the flooring work of CC(1:4:8) and measurement was taken in CUM which is not at all admissible in audit and needs clarification. The details are furnished below.

Calculation of rate of 2.5 cm thick A.S. flooring in C.C (1:2:4) using 12 mm size h.g.c.b chips including punning

etc: -

2.5 cm thick A.S.flooring in C.C (1:2:4) using 12 mm size h.g.c.b chips including punning etc. complete per 1 sqm.						
Labours.						
Mason 1st. Class	0.13	Nos.@Rs.	436.30	/each	Rs.	56.72
Man Mulia	0.14	Nos.@Rs.	286.30	/each	Rs.	40.08
Women Mulia	0.22	Nos.@Rs.	286.30	/each	Rs.	62.99
Materials.						
12 mm H.G.C.B Chips	0.023	Cum@Rs.	1748.55	/Cum	Rs.	40.22
Sand	0.012	Cum@Rs.	277.24	/Cum	Rs.	3.33
Cement	0.0858	Qtl @Rs.	531.27	/Qtl.	Rs.	45.58
					Total:	Rs. 248.91
Add 1% of Labour Charges					Rs.	2.49
					Total:	Rs. 251.40

Calculation of Excess payment: -

L	B	H	QTY	RATE	AMOUNT	Excess paid
QTY OF CC (1:2:4) Item 8, Page 132						
6.05	4.1	0.075	1.860375	5459.73	20362.063	7186.18904
4.3	3.6	0.075	1.161			
18	0.45	0.075	0.6075			
12.1	0.25	0.025	0.075625			
4	0.25	0.025	0.025			
			3.7295			
QTY. OF AS FLOORING						
6.05	4.1		24.805	251.4	13175.874	

However on issue of objection memo Rs. 7186.00 was recovered vide MR No.79338 Dt.19.05.2021. The same was also taken to Cashiers Cash Book. Hence the objection was dropped.

15.13 - Execution of work by violating Govt. guideline (OSP112-113)

Name of the work	Construction of RCC drain from Biju Pattnaik Park to Backside of Sanatan Sahoo shop at LT colony in Work No. 10
Name of the Contractor	Sri Ramesh Kumar Mahali
Voucher No.	Vr. No. 1023 Dt. 24.3.2020
MB No. & Page No.	MB NO. 370 Page No. 39 to 44
Name of the JE	Champak Pradhan

Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra
Scheme	14th.
EC	Rs. 500000.00

On checking of the case record w.r.t. MB it reveals that above drain work was executed. It is observed from the MB that the length of the earth work, CC (1:3:6) and RCC work for the drain was 89.1 Mtr. But the length of the precast slab is 104.16.

It is to mention here that as per **model estimate communicated by H & UD department vide its letter No. 5473/HUD Dt.7.7.13, the length of the precast slab over drain is 50% of the length of the drain executed and the bending binding MS rod of 6mm @ 40kg per cum of concrete work.**

But it is observed from the MB that the length of earth work (vide Item No. 1 Page NO. 40), Sand filling (ite No. P. 41), PCC (1:3:6) (Item No. 3 Page 41) & RCC work (Item No. 4) is 89.1 but the length of the precast Slab is 104.16 by violating the above guideline which is not admitted in audit. The details are furnished below.

AS PER MB/ WORK EXECUTED					ADM AS PER AUDIT				RATE	INADMISSIBLE EXPR
No.	L	B	H	QTY.	L	B	H	QTY		
9	0.93	0.6	0.15	0.7533	44.55	0.6	0.1	2.673	5520.39	18603.7143
103	0.93	0.6	0.1	5.7474						

Besides above the qty of RCC work of the drain is 36.62 (Item No. 4 Page No. 43). Hence, as per guideline, admissible qty. of rod comes to 14.62 (@ 40kg per cum). But 17.46 qtl. Shown as utilised in the work which is also not admitted in audit. The inadmissible expenditure is furnished below.

QTY. OF RCC WORK	SHOWN AS UTILISED	ADMISSIBLE QTY.	RATE	INADMISSIBLE EXPRNEIDUTRE
36.62	17.46	14.648	6487.59	18243.1031

Hence in toto a sum of Rs. 36847.00 (18604.00 + 18243.00) is suggested for recovery.

On issue of objection memo Rs.32999.00 was recovered vide MR No.79351 Dt. 19.05.2021 leaving a balance of Rs. 3848.00. Recovered amount was reflected in the Cashiers Cash Book. Hence the objection was partly settled. For the balance amount of Rs. 3848.00, the following officials are found responsible.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

Sno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Champak kumar Pradhan	JE	at. Choudwar Municipality po.Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	1924
2	Mahesh Prasad Mishra	Asst. Engineer	Choudwar, District-Cuttack	1924

15.14 - Payment towards inadmissible work (osp 113-114)

Name of the work	Construction of CC road and drain from Sital Guru House to Abhiram Parida house in ward No. 14
------------------	--

Name of the Contractor	Sri Amar Kumar Rout
Voucher No.	Vr. No.1019 DDT. 23.3.2020
MB No. & Page No.	MB No. 367182 to 193
Name of the JE	Champak Pradhan
Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra
Scheme	14th.
EC	Rs. 500000.00

On checking of the above case record w.r.t. MB it reveals that above work was executed and recorded in the above-mentioned MB. On gone through the MB and estimate it reveals that the above project was sanctioned for construction road and drain in the Municipal council resolution meeting No. 56 Dt. 26.9.2018 out of 14th Finance grant. Accordingly, an estimate was prepared for Rs. 5,00,000.00 which was Administratively approved by the Sub-Collector & Administrator and Technically sanction by the Municipal Engineer on 17.2.2019. It is to mention here that provision for construction of drain was in both i.e. in the estimate and as well as in the agreement with Mahesh Prasad Mishra, Contractor made on 21.8.2019. But gone through the MB it reveals that there is no drain was constructed. In the place of drain a guard wall was executed which is not admitted in audit. The cost for the construction of guard wall instead of a drain is furnished below.

ITEM NO.	PARTICULARS OF WORK	L	B	H	QTY.	RATE	EXPENDITURE
Item 1 P. 183	Earth work	39.3	0.4	0.6	9.432	261.71	2468.449
Item. 2 P.184	Sand filling	39.3	0.4	0.1	1.572	314.44	494.2997
Item 3 P. 185	CC (1:3:6)	39.3	0.4	0.1	1.572	4279.77	6727.798
Item. 4 P.187	Cc (1:2:4)	39.3	0.25	0.45	4.42125	5520.39	24407.02
Item 5 P. 191	MS Rod				2.28	6487.59	14791.71
Total							48889.28

Hence, cost of the executed structure by violating the contract to a tune of Rs. 48889.00 needs recovery.

On issue of objection memo Rs. 18903.00 was recovered vide MR No. 79342 Dt. 19.5.2021 leaving a balance of Rs.29986.00 for which the following officials are held responsible.

Responsible Person for this paragraph

Sno	Name	Designation	Adress	Amount(In Rs:)
1	Mahesh Prasad Mishra	Asst. Engineer	Choudwar, District-Cuttack	14993
2	Champak kumar Pradhan	JE	at. Choudwar Municipality po.Choudwar Dist.Cuttack	14993

15.15 - Payment towards inadmissible work (OSP114)

Name of the work	Compleiton of Sidhartha Pathagar located at tala Sahi, Ward No.2
Name of the Contractor	Manoj Kumar Nayak
Voucher No.	Vr. No. 40/11.4.19
MB No. & Page No.	MB No. 317 P. 162 to 179
Name of the JE	Subash Chandra Rout, JE, Tangi PS
Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra
Scheme	MLALAD
EC	Rs. 150000

On checking of the above case record w.r.t. MB it reveals that dismantling & removing of 25 cm thick AS flooring work was executed vide item No. 2 at Page No. 162 and Fixing tiles in floors work was executed in item No. 14 But on cross verification it reveals that CC (1:4:8) metalling work was shown as executed at Item No. 4 on the same area at page No. 165 for 2.09 cum @ 3324.99 and Rs. 6949.00 shown as expenditure without dismantling of previous/old metalling work which is not admitted in audit.

On issue of objection memo Rs. 6949.00 was recovered vide MR No.79346 Dt.19.05.2021.The same was also reflected in the Cashiers Cash Book. Hence, the objection was dropped.

15.16 - Excess payment due to adoption of in-proper proportion (OSP-115 to 116)

Name of the work	Completion of Senior Citizen CC located at W. No. 19
Name of the Contractor	Prnaya Ku. Barik
Voucher No.	643/14.11.2019
MB No. & Page No.	354 P. 160 182
Name of the JE	Subash Ch. Rout, JE, Tangi PS
Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra
Scheme	MLALAD
EC	Rs. 400000.00

On checking of the above case record w.r.t. MB it reveals that 93.36 swm. Area was shown as fixing of vitrified tiles in floors or steps and landing on 25mm thick bed of CM (1:1) jointed with neat cement slurry mixed with pigment to match the shade including rubbing and polishing complete excluding cost of precast tile and rate was given @ 334.69 per Sqm.

It is to mention here that, new schedule of Rates-2012 and its supporting Revised Analysis of Rates for 2012 are effective from the date of issue of the order which was communicated vide Works Department, Office Memorandum No. FA-Codes-1/2012-6024/W Dt. Dt. 1.06.2012. The Finance Department have concurred this Schedule of Rates-2012 and the supporting revised analysis of rates for other Building Items (Sl. No. 1 to 11) placed in Chapter-XIX of Analysis of Rates-2006 for 2012 vide their U.O.r No. 133/WF-1-Dt 11.4.2012.

In the said chapter Item No. 1(B), Supplying, fitting and fixing vitrified tile in floors of size 600mm x 600mm of approved make conforming to IS: 13755 laid on 20 mm thick bed of CM (1:4) and filling joints with white cement of approved quantity was allowed for new work.

Hence, 20mm thick CM (1:4) is admissible instead of 25mm thick bed of CM (1:1) as it is new work resulted excess payment of Rs. as calculated below which needs clarification.

Rate of fixing * fixing of Vitrified Tiles with 20mm thick CM(1:4):-

Supplying, Fitting & Fixing Vitrified Tiles in floor of size 600 mm x 600mm Coloured/Printed of approved make with 20mm thick cement mortar 1:4 & filling joints with white Cement of approved quality including cost of all materials labour T&P etc for the work						
Data for 10sqm.						
Labours.						
Mason 1st. Class	2.16	Nos.@Rs.	430.00	/each	Rs.	928.80
Man Mulia	2.16	Nos.@Rs.	280.00	/each	Rs.	604.80
Materials.						
Cost of tile	10.00	Sqm@Rs.	0.00	/Sqm	Rs.	0.00
Sand	0.21	Qtl.@Rs.	48.57	/Qtl.	Rs.	10.20
Cement	0.744	Qtl.@Rs.	541.95	/Qtl.	Rs.	403.21
Cement for slurry	0.33	Qtl.@Rs.	541.95	/Qtl.	Rs.	178.84
White Cement	0.076	Qtl.@Rs.	1515.75	/Qtl.	Rs.	115.20
				Total:	Rs.	2241.05
over head charges 15%						336.16
Sand	0.21		193.67			40.6707
Cement	1.074		16.17			17.36658
Total						2635.25
Labour Cess 1%						26.35246
Rate per 10 cum						2661.60
Rate per cum						266.1598

Calculation of excess payment: -

QTY.	Rate paid	Rate admissible	Inadmissible expenditure
93.36	334.69	266.16	6397.9608

However on issue of objection memo Rs. 6398.00 was recovered vide MR No.79344 Dt. 19.05.2021. Hence, objection was dropped.

15.17 - Expenditure by encroaching the Grant (OSP117)

Name of the work	Constn. of Cultural Centre in Work No. 5
Name of the Contractor	Subash Ch. Barik
Voucher No.	Vr. No. 682/5.12.19

MB No. & Page No.	Mb No. 369 P. 14 to 17 & 87 to 94.
Name of the JE	Subash Ch. Rout, JE, Tangi PS
Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra
Scheme	MPLAD
EC	Rs. 500000.00

On checking of the above case record w.r.t. MB it reveals that a sum of Rs. 465546.00 was shown as payment after statutory deductions. The project was approved vide Lr. No.750 dt. 26.2.19 of DP&MU, Cuttack. AS per MPLAD Guideline, only 75% of the project cost i.e. Rs.375000.00 was released (75% of Rs. 500000.00) in a condition to release the balance amount after submission of UC of Rs. 375000.00. It is clear here that Rs. 1,25,000.00 was utilised by encroaching the Grant from other projects. Hence, objection memo was issued to clarify, whether the balance amount of Rs. 125000.00 was released or not. In response to objection memo local authority replied that "UC has been sent to DP& MU, for release of balance money which will be presente in the next Audit.. Hence, till the recoupment of the grant Rs. 1,25,000.00 is held under objection.

15.18 - Excess payment due to allowing BHGCB rate instead of BHGHB rate (OSP 135)

Name of the work	Constn. of CC Road from Gopal Nayak House to Friends Club in Ward No. 17
Name of the Contractor	Sri Ashok Kumar Sahoo
Voucher No.	846 Dt. 16.01.2020
MB No. & Page No.	MB No. 365 P. 167 to 171
Name of the JE	Champak Pradhan
Name of the AE	Sri Mahesh Prasad Mishra
Scheme	14 th . Finance
EC	Rs. 500000.00

On checking of the above case record w.r.t. MB it reveals CC (1:2:4) work was shown as executed 42.92 cum and recorded at page No. 169 to 170. It is to point out here that the said work was shown as executed in BHGHB but rate was allowed BHGCB resulted excess payment as calculated below.

QTY. EXECUTED	CHIPS REQUIRED (@ 0.9/ in cum)	RATE ADMISSIBLE	RATE ALLOWED	INADMISSIBLE PAYMENT
42.92	38.628	810.48	1048.57	9196.94052

However on issue of objection memo Rs. 9197.00 was recovered vide MR No. 79343 Dt.19.05.2021. The same was also reflected in the Cashiers Cash Book. Hence the objection was dropped.

PARA: 16 AUDIT ON UNITS / DEPARTMENT

16.1 -

There is no separate department exists in this municipality. Hence no comments.

PARA: 17 AUDIT ON SCHEMES / PROGRAMMES
17.1 - FINANCIAL AND PLHYSICAL ACHIEVEMENT OF SCHEMES

The target and achievement figures of some schemes for the year 2019-20 provided to audit by the local authority is furnished below.

SI No	Head of Accounts	FINANCIAL ACHIEVEMENT			PHYSICAL ACHIEVEMENT					
		TOTAL	UTILISATION	% of utilisation	SPILL OVER PROJECT	CURRENT PROJECT	TOTAL	COMPLETED	NOT COMPLETED	% OF ACHIEVEMENT
1	MLALAD	8930285.00	4371256.00	48.95	38	0	38	21	17	55
2	MPLAD	3591236.00	799837.00	22.27	12	0	12	2	10	17
3	Motor Vehicle Tax	6103483.00	1225400.00	20.08	4	24	28	11	17	39
4	Solid Waste Management	3654238.00	4123388.00	11.28	0	4	4	0	4	0
5	14th FC General Area Basic Grant	1094606.00	3293215.00	30.09	15	24	39	19	20	49
6	Tourism & Cultural Fund	2063118.00	826121.00	40.04	3	1	4	1	3	25
7	UNNATI	3007625.00	1078366.00	35.85	39	30	69	29	40	42
8	SDP & Critical Gap Fund	3040212.00	1339454.00	44.06	4	2	6	4	2	67
Total		1998076.00	5640127.00		115	85	200	87	113	

PARA: 18 MISCELLANEOUS
18.1 - Non-Production of Records under SBM Scheme- (2018-19) (OSP 46 & 52)

During the audit of 2918-19 vouchers related to SBM scheme were not produced to audit even after issue of POM. Hence, till production of the above Vouchers before Audit a sum of Rs 368450.00 is kept under objection by the previous year audit.

SI No	Vr No/Date	Particulars of the Payment	Amount
1	217/25.8.2018	Construction of Fixing of MS Iron Sign Board in different area for ODF Programme in 19 Wards , Contractor- SoumyaranjanParida	264120
2	223/6.11.2018	Swechaagraha oh Members,Jhulendra Nayak	54000
3	219/7.9.2018	Payment of Sign Board & Sound Light used for SBM,Jhulendra Nayak	7420
4	230/25.11.2018	Fixing of Iron Grill under SBM in CDR,Mpity,Contractor-SoumyaranjanParida - No deduction,No Bill or Voucher enclosed	43000
		Total	368540

Hence, objection memo was issued to take early steps for production of the same before present audit. But no action was taken by the local authority in this regard. Hence the attention of the higher authority was drawn here by for further action.

18.2 - Non production of the present Status of Execution of the required Projects by the Executive Engineer PH Division No-II Cuttack (OSP 46 to 47 & 53)

It was revealed from the previous year audit report that a sum of Rs 50 Lacs as details furnished below were placed to the Executive Engineer PH Division No-II Cuttack during 2018-19 out of UNNATI Grant for execution of some projects in public interest. But the Development Section could not be able to supply any such information regarding present status of the Projects as on 31.03.2019 to the previous audit.

Voucher No/date	Particulars of the Payment	Amount
261/2.6.2018 out of UNNATI Grant	Paid to Executive Engineer PH Division No-II Cuttack towards Payment of 10Nos of Sinking of Tube Wells in Ward No-12 of Choudwar Municipality	1500000
478/13.07.2018 out of UNNATI Grant	Paid to Executive Engineer PH Division No-II, Cuttack towards Payment of 14 Nos of Sinking of Water Supply Pipe Line in connection in Ward No-11 & 08 of Choudwar Municipality	3500000
TOTAL	Grand Total	5000000

As the amount is booked as Final expenditure in the books of Account, there is no further scope in Audit to verify it's proper utilization in public interest. The attention of the Local Authority is invited in this regard to make

correspondence with the Executive Engineer PH Division No-II Cuttack for early completion of the projects and fact reported to the next Audit. Hence a sum of Rs 50,00,000.00 is kept under objection till detailed clarification of the present progress and status of the projects is furnished before next audit.

Hence, objection memo was issued to take early steps for production of the same before present audit. But no action was taken by the local authority in this regard. Hence the attention of the higher authority was drawn here by for further action.

18.3 - Non production of Central Stock Register of Wheat: - (OSP 54)

The Central Stock register regarding wheat for the period from 4/2016 to 11/2016 and stock register of ward no.6,7,8,9,10&19,11,17&18 were not produced to audit for verification. The Local Authority is once again impressed upon to produce the relevant stock register to the current audit for further verification. Since this is a matter of utmost significance, attention of higher authority is hereby drawn for non-availability of records to audit.

But no action was taken by the local authority in this regard till the close of audit. Hence the attention of the higher authority was drawn here by for further action.

18.4 - Production of Distress warrant Register - (OSP 54)

Distress Warrant Register required under Rule – 202 of O.M. Rules 1953 has not been maintained in the Municipality. As a result, the position of Distress warrant issued and amount of tax collected could not be worked out. In response to preliminary objection memo the local authority remained silent. Hence the local authority was suggested to ensure the maintenance of the same and produced to the current ongoing audit for necessary verification.

In response to the objection memo issued by the present no action was taken by the local authority in this regard. Hence the attention of the higher authority was drawn here by for further action.

18.5 - Production of Electrical Goods Documents- (OSP 41 & 54)

Examination of purchase file no.38/17 collection No.V.38/17 on procurement of electrical goods for maintenance of street lighting and other places, it is revealed that a total sum of Rs.32,61,123.00 has been spent out of the 4TH SFC grants and Own fund indicated against each purchase lot during the financial year 17-18 ,out of which delayed commencement of work of worth Rs 829747.00 as detailed below may be clarified to the current Audit.

Sl No	Voucher No/date	Details of Supplier	Amount
1	Vr No.1091/27.11.17	SanskrutEntp	515375
2	Vr No.1391/3.3.18	SanskrutEntp	314372
	Total		829747

At the time of last exit conference, the EO had stated that though the agreement had been signed in the month of August -17 the real work started in the month of last week of August 2018. Hence the procurement of Electrical goods was done through out the year 2017-18 and last procurement was made in the month of March 2018, keeping in view to the interest of the public .

However, no evidence could be produced against delay in commencement of the replacement by the M/s. EESL company. Further, no compensation has been claimed from the company for the liquidated damage caused due to delay in commencement of the work. In view of the reply of the E.O. the fresh agreement between the Municipal authority and EESL regarding delayed commencement of work may be produced before current audit for

necessary verification.

In response to the objection memo issued by the present audit, no action was taken by the local authority in this regard. Hence the attention of the higher authority was drawn here by for further action.

In response to objection memo local authority fails to produced any documents in this regard. Hence local authority advised to produced the same before next audit.

18.6 - Non-Production of Receipt Book for 2018-19 (OSP 41 & 55)

As per the previous year audit report, It was found that receipt No-70801 to 70900 was issued to Saroj Kumar Rout, Ex TD. But the said receipt along with the concerned DCR could not yet be produced to Audit for necessary verification. However, the EO is advised to cause production of the said MR before present audit for verification.

In response to objection memo issued by the present audit, no action was taken by the local authority in this regard. Hence the attention of the higher authority was drawn here by for further action.

18.7 - Handing over of Dustbins without acknowledgement

As per the previous year audit report, while audit the the Sanitation Stock & Issue Register with reference to the concerned File It is observed that 80 numbers of Fiber Dustbins were purchased amounting to Rs 580560.00 vide voucher No-883/29.09.2018. In Stock Register the same quantity of Dustbins were found to be stock entered & then shown issued to different Places of the Choudwar Municipality during 2018-19. But the exact location of delivery of the Dustbins and the acknowledgement of receipt/installation of the Dustbins in the public interest could not be ensured before Audit even after issue of POM.

In response to objection memo issued by the present audit, no action was taken by the local authority in this regard. Hence the attention of the higher authority was drawn here by for further action.

18.8 - APPROVAL FROM THE COMPETENT AUTHORITY WANTING REARIDNG ENGAGMENT OF OUTSOURCING OF SERVICES: - (OSP 123-124)

As per Finance Department Office Memorandum No. **FIN-CODE-RULE-1/2018 No.37323/F., Dated 30.11.2018**, a guideline was issued regarding engagement of outsourcing of services, where it is clearly mention in the Section-B,

Clause- iii) Authority competent to outsource services:

The competent authority i.e. Administrative Departments and Heads of Departments may allow outsourcing of certain services in the interest of economy and efficiency.

Clause- iv) Condition's precedent to outsourcing:

Outsourcing of services may be resorted to if adequate man-power is not available in the Organization for providing the required services.

Clause- v) Identification of the service to be outsourced:

The identification of the service to be outsourced is to be finalized by the Administrative Department and Head of Department in respect of its own Office or any attached or subordinate Office(s).

Besides, above **Govt. in H & UD department, in its Lr. No.28708/HUD Dt. 7.12.2016** to streamlining implementation of Swachh Bharat Mission (SBM) a guideline was issued where it is clearly mentioned that, a detailed plan in terms of (a) Man power, (b) no. & type of vehicles, (c) no. & type of garbage bins (d) collection route chart is to be prepared and sent to the MD, SBM by 20.12.2016.

During the course of audit, it is revealed that a sum of Rs. 29332853.00 was shown as payment towards outsourcing of services engagement in the Municipality. From the above-mentioned Finance Memorandum, **Authority competent to outsource services, Condition's precedent to outsourcing and Identification of the service to be outsourced is Administrative Department and Head of the Department.** Hence to justify the genuineness of the below mention expenditure, approval of the competent authority may kindly be produced before audit. Besides this, the Sanitation plan prepared to achieve the objectives of the clean city which is open defecation free and wherein solid waste is managed efficiently submitted to the MD, SBM for approval may kindly be produced before audit for verification. The details of the expenditure are furnished below.

PARTICULARS OF PAYMENT	VOUCHER No. & DATE	AMOUNT
Swarnadevi (sanitation) (Nov-18 to Jan 19)	29/03-04-2019	1827645.00
Swarnadevi agency 2/19 to may 19	179/01-07-2019	2333560.00
Swarnadevi agency for 6/19 to 7/19 &vda	566/14-10-2019	2651900.00
Swarnadevi agency for sweeping bill 8/19 & 9/19	649/16-11-2019	1498620.00
Swarna Devi Agency ((10/19 to 11/19) & VDA4/19 to 11/19)	867/22-01-2020	1651681.00
Swarna Devi Agency 12/19 & 1/20	947/04-03-2020	1579948.00
TOTAL		11543354.00
Manju Service, (Nov-18 to Jan 19)	30/03-04-2019	1750170.00
Manju service 2/19 to 5/19	180/01-07-2019	2411660.00
Manju Service 6/19 to 7/19 &vda	567/14-10-2019	2606528.00
Manju Service for cleaning 8/19 & 9/19	651/16-11-2019	1523030.00
Manju Service (10/19 to 11/19) & VDA4/19 to 11/19)	868/22-01-2020	1669339.00
Manju Service for cleaning 12/19 & 1/20	946/04-03-2020	1600770.00
TOTAL		11561497.00
Sanskriti Association for January 19 to March 19	80/14-05-2019	981764.00
Sanskriti Association pvtltd 4/2019	132/12-06-2019	344095.00
Sanskriti Association pvt ltd 5/19 to 6/19	267/02-08-2019	1359868.00
Sanskriti Association for 7/19 to 8/19	565/14-10-2019	872015.00
Sanskrutika association for 9/29	679/04-12-2019	367823.00
TOTAL		3925565.00

KM Enterprises for man power for 10/19	678/4.12.2019	420201.00
KM enterprises man powere 11/2019	752/1.1.2020	416186.00
KM enterprisies man power for 12/19	863/18.1.2020	421626.00
KM enterprisies man power for 1/2020	930/13.2.2020	562574.00
KM enterprisies man power for 2/2020	989/18.3.2020	481850.00
TOTAL		2302437.00
G. TOTAL		29332853.00

18.9 - WAGS OF THE OUTSOURCED EMPLOYEES WERE PAID BY VIOLATING THE GOVT. INSTRUCTIONS:

-

In the Finance Department Lr.No. __49134(255)/F., dated Bhubaneswar the 29.11.2010, Model Bidding documents was given for Engagement of personnel through service providers in Government Officers/ organizations. it is clarified in this letter that, there is no uniformity in the award of contract as well as payment of legitimate dues to the persons so outsourced by the manpower service provider. This results in payment of low wages to the appointees who were engaged on outsourcing basis, tough the service provider is paid adequately and as per agreement. There is also no embedded mechanism at present for ensuring quality of the manpower provided by the service providers.

Hence, the Government, after careful consideration, have been pleased to decide that henceforth all such contracts for engaging manpower through service providers shall be made through a transparent, competitive and fair procedure in order to secure best value for money. Accordingly, a model bidding / tender document as well as model agreement to be entered between the Authority and the Agency have been prepared and enclosed in this letter.

In the said letter it is also mentioned that Minimum take home remuneration per person should be Rs. 5200/- for Jr. Stenographer, Jr. Clerk, Jr. Typist, DEO and Driver and Rs. 4400/- for Attendant, Peon and Watchman etc.

Besides this Vide Lr. No. 2 8 0 9 0 /F., Date: 22.09.2017 Government have been pleased to revise the monthly consolidated remuneration of out sources contractual employees. The amount is Pay + Grade Pay of the post of the employee (inclusive of the ESI/ EPF dues of the employer). The revised remuneration structure will be effective from 01.09.2017.

The personnel outsourced from the service providers will continue to draw the existing remuneration as per the ongoing contracts till the expiry of the ongoing contracts and the revised remuneration will be applicable only for new contracts after 1st September 2017.

After this Vide Lr. No. FIN-PCC-PAY-0006-2017/ 11835 /F, Date: 31.03. Government is pleased to make the following modifications to the Circular dated. 22.09.2017 mentioned that, the employers? contribution towards EPF and ESI for personnel outsourced through service providers will be reimbursed over and above the amount of consolidated remuneration as in the table at para-1 (Pay + Grade pay) of the aforesaid circular subject to satisfactory proof of such contribution and this revision will be effective from 1.09.2017 uniformly for all existing outsourcing contracts as well as new contracts after 1.09.2017. The existing contracts may be modified accordingly.

On checking of the vouchers w.r.t. accountant cash book it reveals that, the remuneration / wages of the employees were allowed on the basis of Unskilled, Semi-skilled, Skilled, highly skilled basis as per the notification of the Labour and ESI notification rates by violating the above Guidelines issued by the Finance Department resulted huge loss to the Municipal Fund. Hence it needs clarification.

18.10 - CLARIFICATION WANTING REGARDING TDS @10% FROM a/C No. 3540101005125 (Critical Gap fund):- (OSP 133)

On checking of the cash book w.r.t. pass book it reveals that a sum of Rs. 2638.00 was debited from the account No. 3540101005125, Canara Bank relates to Critical Gap Fund towards TDS @ 10%. As per Govt. guideline, no TDS will be deducted in case the account is operated for Govt. grant and utilised the funds for the public interest. Hence, what type of steps are taken by the authority to recoup the same may kindly be intimated to audit.

No compliance received till close of audit. Hence, till the recoupment of the same Rs. 2638.00 is held under objection.

18.11 - PRESENT STATUS OF WORK WANTING: - (osp 118)

A sum of 2174796.00 was given to BDA for Electrification of Bijupattnaik Park in Word No. 10 of the CDR Municipality vide Vr. No. 959 Dt. 11.3.2020 out of 14th FCA. The present position of the above work may kindly be intimated to audit along with the documentary evidence.

Till the production of the utilisation of the same Rs. 2174796.00 is held under objection.

18.12 -

.

18.13 -

18.14 -

PARA: 19 AUDIT OF LOAN/DEPOSITS/CPF INCLUDING POSITIONS
19.1 - Remittance of Govt. Dues -

Rule-04 of Odisha Treasury Code, Vol-I read with Rule 4 of OGFR stipulate that all money received or realized on behalf of Govt. should be deposited in full into treasury or with competent authority within 3 days of its realization. Retention of Govt. money or revenue outside the treasury is irregular and not permissible. The details of position of Govt. dues during 2019-20 is furnished below

PARTICULARS	Royalty	VAT	Labour Cess	P.T	I.T	Service Tax	GST	Total
Opening Balance	24558.00	598587.00	62456.00	21987.00	43140.00	0.00	48956.00	799684.00
Receipt during the year	436762.00	0.00	314678.00	109925.00	260704.00		413752.00	1535821.00
Total	461320.00	598587.00	377134.00	131912.00	303844.00	0.00	462708.00	2335505.00
Deposited	412219.00	0.00	279844.00	109925.00	219471.00		440336.00	1461795.00
Balance as on 31.3.2020	49101.00	598587.00	97290.00	21987.00	84373.00	0.00	22372.00	873710.00

As per Rule-6 of OTC Vol-I amount collected towards revenue of State Govt. should be remitted into the treasury within 3days from receipt of said amount. In respect of collected GST ,it may be deposited within the 10 days of the next month in which it is collected

It is hereby suggested to directly consult with the now GST Authorities to find out a solution to deposit the outstanding VAT amount rolling idle since long. The local authority was suggested to deposit all the Govt. dues as soon as possible under intimation to audit failing which responsibility would be fixed against the Executive Officer.

19.2 - Loan

As per Rule 149 of the Odisha Municipal Rules, 1953 a Loan Register is to be maintained(Form No.XXVII). Further, Rule 150 of the Odisha Municipal Rules, 1953 envisages that the loan amount shall not be appropriated even temporarily to any object other than that for which the loan was raised. But during audit no such Loan Register was maintained and produced before audit for verification. The position of outstanding Loan as per previous Audit Report as on 31-03-20 is furnished below:-

Sl.no.	Particulars of loan	Amount	Sanction order/GO No	Re-payment during 2018-19		Pending for Payment as on 31.03.2020		Closing Date
1	IDSMT	1600000.00	8867/dt.25.03.2	160000.00	68800.00	160000.00	33600.00	27.03.2022
	Total					160000.00	33600.00	

Therefore the local authority is advised to clear all the outstanding loan amounts within due period by creation of sinking fund and compliance reported

19.3 - Deposits

S.D / E.M.D :- As per Rule – 142 of O.M. Rules 1953 Deposit Ledger is to be maintained and as per Rule 143 of O.M. Rules 1953 list outstanding deposits are to be maintained at the close of every quarter. But in this Municipality neither deposit ledger has been maintained nor list of outstanding deposits at the close of every quarter have been worked out. Further no information was available in the last audit report (prior to 2018-19). However, the position of outstanding deposit relating to 2019-20 is furnished below. on the basis of the FY-2018-19 audit report.

OPENING BALANCE	600499.00
RECEIPT (SD/WH/EMD)	1698405.00
TOTAL	2298904.00
PAYMENT	3688739.00
BALANCE	-1389835.00

Non-Maintenance of Deposit Ledger and outstanding deposits: -

As required under Rule 142 and under Rule 143 of Odisha Municipal Rules, 1953, the deposit ledger and register of outstanding deposit has not been maintained by this Municipality. Due to non-maintenance of above register, there is a possibility of refund of excess deposit or double refund of deposits which would cause the loss of Municipality fund. Therefore, the local authority is advised to maintain the above registers for safe guard of Municipality fund. Due to non maintenance of the Deposit Ledger present audit fails to ascertain the present position of the Deposit. Hence local authority advised to prepare the required deposit ledger and produce the same before next audit, till than Rs. 1389835.00 is held under objection.

19.4 - CPF / EPF Position of Municipality Employees (OSP 56)

In accordance with Rule 436 of O.M. Rules, 1953 every council shall maintain and administer a provident Fund. As per Rule 442 of O.M. Rules, 1953 a provident fund ledger in Form No. P.F 5 is to be kept in the Municipal Office. As per Rule 445 of O.M. Rules, 1953 the amount deducted from the pay bills as Provident Fund deductions and the contributions paid by the council and other sums relating to the provident fund shall be lodged in the Government Treasury and a separate cash book shall be maintained. The whole or any portion of such deduction, contributions and other sums relating to provident fund may be withdrawn from the treasury at such intervals as may be necessary for investment in interest bearing securities or deposits. As per Rules 446 of O.M. Rules, 1953 investments shall be made as early as practicable in the form of securities or deposits specified in the Rule. As per Rule 449 of O.M. Rules, 1953 the provident fund ledger, Abstract register, Cash Book and other records of the fund shall be examined monthly by the Executive Officer and shall be audited by the Examiner of Local Fund Account. No CPF ledger / EPF Cash Book has not been maintained by the Municipality since inception as required under Rules 436 of O.M Rules, 1953. The C.P.F position of staff for the financial year 2017-18 has been prepared as per acquittance rolls and the details of deduction and deposit position are furnished below : The CPF / EPF position of the Municipality for the year 2019-20 is furnished below :

Sl. No.	Name of the Employees	P.F Account No	O.B as on 01.04.2019	Deposit & Interest	Amount withdrawn during 2019-20	CB as on 31.03.2020
1	Shantilata Nayak, T.C	006266	240348.00	61705.00	0.00	302053.00

2	Rama Chandra Pradhan, T.C.	006310	273528.00	44275.00	0.00	317803.00
3	Rabi Narayan Sahoo, Sweeper	084901000065 39	45566.85	61833.15	40000.00	107400.00
4	Raju Naik-II, Sweeper	084901000066 27	164808.00	68873.00	-	233681.00
5	Santosh Kumar Sarangi, Sweeper	084901000066 28	12689.95	39550.05	50000.00	52240.00
6	Ashok Kumar Sahoo, Sweeper	084901000066 29	185535.10	-36747.10	100000.00	148788.00
7	Satura Naik, Sweeper	084901000066 34	13254.00	26485.00	46000.00	39739.00
8	Binu Gochhayat, Sweeper	084901000066 35	47809.00	-5351.00	65000.00	42458.00
9	Manua Naik, Sweeper	084901000066 40	10801.00	28038.00	64000.00	38839.00
10	Sridhar Barik, Peon	084901000066 43	74839.00	54986.95	50000.00	129825.95
11	Sangram Keshari Pradhan, T.C.	084901000066 47	127455.28	-66602.60	150000.00	60852.68
12	Laxmidhar Swain, Peon	084901000066 49	67761.24	134907.10	100000.00	202668.34
13	Pabitra Kumar Choudhury, Peon	084901000066 79	43886.00	65911.00	30000.00	109797.00
14	Jhulendra Kumar Nayak, T.C.	084901000068 29	79052.00	57502.00	0.00	136554.00
15	Raturaj Muduli, Peon	084901000068 95	88834.59	27532.00	8000.00	116366.59
16	Tapan Kumar Sahoo, Zamadar	084901000068 97	190332.00	4126.75	0.00	194458.75
17	Sk. Kamal Mustafa, Driver	084901000068 98	211516.00	-137043.00	180000.00	74473.00
18	Tuni Dei, Sweeper	084901000069 60	107890.00	-16968.00	100000.00	90922.00
19	Sk. Dilwar Mohammad, Sweeper	084901000069 75	54297.00	27274.00	65000.00	81571.00

20	Pabitra Kumar Mohapatra, Peon	084901000070 11	156705.00	-40946.00	100000.00	115759.00
21	Sankarsan Beura, Peon	084901000070 13	91346.00	36945.00	50000.00	128291.00
22	Nayana Nayak, Sweeper	084901000072 80	28802.00	38362.00	50000.00	67164.00
23	Santosh Kumar Hota, T.C.	084901000075 37	186531.78	25946.22	0.00	212478.00
24	Binapani Singh, Peon	084901000078 95	206943.00	2616.00	0.00	209559.00
25	Mahadev Prasad Jena, Sr. Asst.	084901100561 58	62980.73	66435.00	95000.00	129415.73
26	Debasis Mohapatra, Jr. Asst.	084901100628 52	9430.57	25318.40	0.00	34748.97
27	Sujit Kumar Das	084901100845 57	50100.00	22064.86	0.00	72164.86

PARA: 20 RESULT OF AUDIT AND CONCLUSION

20.1 -

Maintenance of Accountant Cash Book:

The accountant cash book has not been maintained properly as pointed out below.

1.The details of closing balance of Accountant's cash book i.e. Funds in PL account, in Bank, in shape of investment, in shape of advance & cash in hand should have been mentioned at the end of each day's transaction. But, the same has never been recorded throughout the year 2018-19. Opening Balance of the cash book is based on the Opening Balance of the bank pass books which is incorrect since this gives an enhanced OB for the cash book due to the un encashed cheques of the previous year.

2.In some cases, amount received through cheques/BDS are directly credited in Bank A/Cs without being reflected in cash book.

3.Advance position has not been reflected in the cash book.

4.Bank position as per cash book has not been worked out and bank reconciliation on monthly basis and at the end of the year has not be been done.

.5.Cash Analysis also needs to be done

6.Multiple Bank A/Cs against a single scheme have been operated in this Municipality.

7.Some Dormant Bank/Postal A/Cs have been rolling since long and in a few cases non-operation charges have

been deducted by Bank.

8. A huge amount in respect of Royalty, L. Cess, VAT, I.Tax, Service Tax etc has not been deposited in proper head of A/Cs.

9. No adequate monitoring, periodical inspection, supervision have been made to safeguard the leakage in assessment & collection of Municipal Revenue in respect of different Taxes, Rent, Fees & Fines etc.

10. Non-revision of Annual value of holdings resulting Loss of Municipal Revenue.

11. Non-imposition of penalty for delay in completion of work as per agreement.

12. Non-conduct of supervision (by the Control & Testing Laboratory) on the quality of materials Maintenance of abstract Register of Receipts and Expenditures:

The abstract register of receipts and expenditures has not been maintained properly by the local authority. Though month-wise abstract has been worked out, due to non-maintenance of head-wise entries of individual transaction of receipts and expenditures as per budgetary heads, it was not possible on the part of the audit to check their correctness while arriving at the receipt and expenditure position of the municipality. Grant register should be maintained properly by the local authority on priority basis. Even though audit could find out the receipt position of grants on the basis of the BD register and grant files, the expenditures of grant money get mixed with expenditures from municipal fund and it is difficult to reach at the exact position of grants. Further diversion of funds is not clearly visible to audit as well as the local authority. Recommendations:- A properly maintained grant register is urgently required to make the grant position correct and transparent. The DDO should maintain a register for reconciliation of receipts and disbursement of scheme funds as per Lr No 15847/F/27.4.13 of finance department. Double Entry Book keeping System has not been followed in the municipality as is revealed from the records and registers relating to 2017-18 . Loss of stock & store of sale centers is a regular happening at Choudwar Municipality. In spite of that the local authority vest the charge of the sale center at the same hand. There is huge pendency of UCs to be submitted. The local authority is advised to look into the matter. Time barred register relating to holding tax etc should be maintained by the local authority. Grievance redressal system to be online so that citizen can assess the status of his grievance. In view of the audit observations narrated above, the state of maintenance of accounts of Choudwar Municipality during the financial year 2018-19 may not be rated as satisfactory. Needless to mention that irregular, improper as well as haphazard maintenance of accounts will provide ample scope for occurrence of fraud & error. However, special attention of municipal authorities is invited to look into the matter seriously and help improved the state by taking the appropriate remedial measures

As a result of this Audit transactions involving a sum of Rs 20624752.00 are held under objection which include an amount of Rs 9943130.00 suggested for recovery. Besides, a sum of Rs 395537 was recovered at the instance of audit. The details are furnished in the following tables.

Result Of Audit

SI No	Name Of The Paragraph	Amount suggested for recovery(In Rs:)	Amount kept on objection(In Rs:)	Amount Sur chargeable(In Rs:)	Amount Em bezzlement(In Rs:)	Amount Oth ercases(In Rs:)	Remarks
1	8.1	213751.00	213751.00	213751.00	0.00	0.00	
2	11.2	1500.00	1500.00	1500.00	1500.00	0.00	
3	13.10	0.00	299592.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	

4	13.11	1600.00	1600.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
5	13.13	2106592.00	2106592.00	2106592.00	0.00	0.00	
6	13.14	0.00	432731.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
7	13.17	1755716.00	1755716.00	1755716.00	0.00	0.00	
8	14.1	33428.00	33428.00	33428.00	0.00	0.00	
9	14.3	0.00	2500000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
10	14.4	0.00	302388.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
11	14.5	0.00	620000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
12	14.6	52000.00	52000.00	52000.00	0.00	0.00	
13	14.7	0.00	32124.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
14	14.8	33200.00	33200.00	33200.00	0.00	0.00	
15	14.9	31920.00	209376.00	31920.00	0.00	0.00	
16	14.10	0.00	15707.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
17	14.11	144272.00	144272.00	144272.00	0.00	0.00	
18	14.12	219921.00	219921.00	219921.00	0.00	0.00	
19	14.13	112611.00	112611.00	112611.00	0.00	0.00	
20	14.14	56824.00	56824.00	56824.00	0.00	0.00	
21	14.16	0.00	483536.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
22	14.17	0.00	48429.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
23	14.18	1957.00	1957.00	1957.00	0.00	0.00	
24	14.19	52720.00	52720.00	52720.00	0.00	0.00	
25	14.20	711215.00	711215.00	0.00	0.00	711215.00	
26	14.21	73527.00	73527.00	73527.00	0.00	0.00	
27	14.22	877526.00	877526.00	877526.00	0.00	0.00	
28	14.23	548625.00	548625.00	548625.00	0.00	0.00	
29	14.24	276832.00	276832.00	276832.00	0.00	0.00	
30	14.25	2772.00	2772.00	2772.00	0.00	0.00	
31	14.26	3750.00	3750.00	3750.00	0.00	0.00	
32	14.27	21112.00	21112.00	21112.00	0.00	0.00	
33	14.28	86740.00	86740.00	86740.00	0.00	0.00	
34	14.29	118329.00	118329.00	118329.00	0.00	0.00	
35	14.30	18714.00	18714.00	18714.00	0.00	0.00	
36	14.31	0.00	140400.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
37	14.32	23066.00	23066.00	23066.00	0.00	0.00	
38	14.33	1964365.00	1964365.00	1964365.00	0.00	0.00	
39	14.34	121715.00	121715.00	121715.00	0.00	0.00	
40	14.35	0.00	134010.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
41	14.36	30800.00	30800.00	30800.00	0.00	0.00	
42	14.37	0.00	144155.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
43	14.38	0.00	1210359.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
44	14.39	38220.00	38220.00	38220.00	0.00	0.00	
45	14.40	30833.00	30833.00	30833.00	0.00	0.00	
46	14.41	1000.00	1000.00	1000.00	0.00	0.00	
47	15.1	136157.00	136157.00	136157.00	0.00	0.00	

48	15.5	0.00	150000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
49	15.8	0.00	298466.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
50	15.9	5986.00	5986.00	5986.00	0.00	0.00	
51	15.13	3848.00	3848.00	3848.00	0.00	0.00	
52	15.14	29986.00	29986.00	29986.00	0.00	0.00	
53	15.17	0.00	125000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
54	18.10	0.00	2638.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
55	18.11	0.00	2174796.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
56	19.3	0.00	1389835.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
Total		9943130.00	20624752.00	9230315.00	1500.00	711215.00	

Spot Recovery

Sl No	Ref Para No/Audit Objection Statement Page No	M.R.No	Date	Amount(In Rs.)	Name of the person
1	15.11	79337	2021-05-19	18173	Jitendra Ku. Sahoo
2	15.12	79338	2021-05-19	7186	Ritesh Ku. Jena
3	15.13	79351	2021-05-19	32999	Sri Ramesh Kumar Mahali
4	15.14	79342	2021-05-19	18903	Sri Amar Kumar Rout
5	15.15	79346	2021-05-19	6949	Manoj Kumar Nayak
6	15.16	79344	2021-05-19	6398	Prnaya Ku. Barik
7	15.18	79343	2021-05-19	9197	Sri Ashok Kumar Sahoo
8	13.15	Ch. No. 855149	2021-04-05	99000	M/s. Tarent traders
9	14.15	79335	2021-05-19	5962	Basanti Sahoo, C.O
10	14.15	79334	2021-05-19	6000	Subhadra Nayak, MIS, Contractua
11	14.2	79336	2021-05-19	3000	Basanti Sahoo, C.O
12	11-1	79353	2021-06-18	2000	Sri Tapan Kumar Sahoo, Jamadar
13	15.10	79339	2021-05-19	41832	Sri Mangaraj Behera
14	15.7	79350	2021-05-19	8112	Soumya Ranjan Parida
15	15.9	79347	2021-05-19	51268	Majoj Kumar Nayak
16	15.6	79341	2021-05-19	7647	Sri Dillip Kumar Bhanja
17	15.5	79349	2021-05-19	8498	Ajit Ku. Mohanty

18	15.4	79345	2021-05-19	7053	Sri Susanta Ku. Behera
19	15.3	79340	2021-05-19	11989	Sri Subash Ch. Barik
20	15.2	79348	2021-05-19	43371	Sri Samarajit Dalai
				Total	395537

Audit Certificate

Cetrified that the accounts of **Choudwar Municipality** for the financial year **2019-2020** have been covered under audit and found correct subject to the comments / remarks offered in the foregoing paragraphs .