3324

9th October, 1962.

REGISTERED A/D

Dear Mr. Bateshwar Prasad Singh,

Your letter of 14th August and 3rd September (which, on inspection turn out to be the same letter) have been placed before me on my return to Bombay from abroad a few days back.

2. I regret to note that your letter contains a series of misstatements for which there is no basis whatsoever and I deny every statement which has not been expressly admitted in my letters or the relevent records of the Party of which copies have been furnished to the Raja Saheb of Ramgarh.

3. The circumstances in which the credit was opened by Raja Bahadur of Ramgarh and the assistance given to him in meeting his requirements are recorded in a series of resolutions of the Parliamentary Sub-Committee and Parliamentary Board of the Party and I do not propose in this letter to set them out all over again. These facts are well known to Raja Saheb and form part of the minutes which have been approved, from time to time, without any objection on his part as a member of the Parliamentary Sub-Committee and the Parliamentary Board. The allegation that the credit was opened in the name of Raja Saheb because the Party could not open an overdraft account or that the Raja Saheb lent his name is denied.

4. In so far as the issue that you raise in your letter about payment of interest is concerned, there again the position is quite different from what you have attempted to make out. It has throughout been clearly understood that the interest on the entire loan was to be paid by the Raja Saheb to the Bank as the liability for the loan was entirely his and the loan was opened for his benefit. When the matter came up for discussion at the meeting of the Parliamentary Sub-Committee on 14th March 1962 in Bombay, the arrangement made was recorded in the minutes which were approved at a later meeting. It was clearly stipulated that the Raja Saheb had not only to pay the balance of Rs.1,20,000 but also the interest that had accrued on the loan. The Raja Saheb had agreed to pay off whatever was due from him to the Bank in a short time. The minutes further lay down that, if such repayment was not made by the Raja Saheb, the monthly instalment of Rs.20,000 would continue to be paid on the Raja Saheb's behalf until the amount of Rs.2,80,000 was exhausted.

...2

5. On 19th April, I wrote to the Raja Saheb drawing his attention to the decision of 14th March of the Parliamentary Sub-Committee and requesting him to let me know when he proposed to repay Rs.1,20,000 along with interest on the loan so that arrangements could be made to repay the balance of the loan in the manner that had been decided by the Parliamentary Sub-Committee. I also informed him that in the meantime, monthly payments of Rs.20,000 would continue. No reply was received from Raja Saheb to that letter.

6. You will thus see how baseless are the statements you have made in regard to the liability for the payment of interest.

7. It is noted that, while you keep on repeating that Raja Saheb will pay whatever is due by him, you give no indication of the date when such payment will be made.

8. This is to inform you that the final payment of Rs.20,000 in respect of the month of October 1962 was made on behalf of Raja Saheb on October 5. Since the amount that he wished to be spent in that manner and which the Party agreed to pay to the Bank on his behalf has been fully expended, will you please note that it will not be possible for any further payment to be made to the Bank on his behalf from this end ?

Yours truly,

[redacted]

(M. R. MASANI)
General Secretary.

Thakur Bateshwar Prasad Singh, M.P.
Top Floor,
22, Chittaranjan Avenue,
CALCUTTA 13.

9th October, 1962.

REGISTERED A/D

Dear Mr. Bateshwar Prasad Singh,

Your letter of 14th August and 3rd September (which, on inspection turn out to be the same letter) have been placed before me on my return to Bombay from abroad a few days back.

2. I regret to note that your letter contains a series of misstatements for which there is no basis whatsoever and I deny every statement which has not been expressly admitted in my letters or the relevent records of the Party of which copies have been furnished to the Raja Saheb of Ramgarh.

3. The circumstances in which the credit was opened by Raja Bahadur of Ramgarh and the assistance given to him in meeting his requirements are recorded in a series of resolutions of the Parliamentary Sub-Committee and Parliamentary Board of the Party and I do not propose in this letter to set them out all over again. These facts are well known to Raja Saheb and form part of the minutes which have been approved, from time to time, without any objection on his part as a member of the Parliamentary Sub-Committee and the Parliamentary Board. The allegation that the credit was opened in the name of Raja Saheb because the Party could not open an overdraft account or that the Raja Saheb lent his name is denied.

4. In so far as the issue that you raise in your letter about payment of interest is concerned, there again the position is quite different from what you have attempted to make out. It has throughout been clearly understood that the interest on the entire loan was to be paid by the Raja Saheb to the Bank as the liability for the loan was entirely his and the loan was opened for his benefit. When the matter came up for discussion at the meeting of the Parliamentary Sub-Committee on 14th March 1962 in Bombay, the arrangement made was recorded in the minutes which were approved at a later meeting. It was clearly stipulated that the Raja Saheb had not only to pay the balance of Rs.1,20,000 but also the interest that had accrued on the loan. The Raja Saheb had agreed to pay off whatever was due from him to the Bank in a short time. The minutes further lay down that, if such repayment was not made by the Raja Saheb, the monthly instalment of Rs.20,000 would continue to be paid on the Raja Saheb's behalf until the amount of Rs.2,80,000 was exhausted.

...2

5. On 19th April, I wrote to the Raja Saheb drawing his attention to the decision of 14th March of the Parliamentary Sub-Committee and requesting him to let me know when he proposed to repay Rs.1,20,000 along with interest on the loan so that arrangements could be made to repay the balance of the loan in the manner that had been decided by the Parliamentary Sub-Committee. I also informed him that in the meantime, monthly payments of Rs.20,000 would continue. No reply was received from Raja Saheb to that letter.

6. You will thus see how baseless are the statements you have made in regard to the liability for the payment of interest.

7. It is noted that, while you keep on repeating that Raja Saheb will pay whatever is due by him, you give no indication of the date when such payment will be made.

8. This is to inform you that the final payment of Rs.20,000 in respect of the month of October 1962 was made on behalf of Raja Saheb on October 5. Since the amount that he wished to be spent in that manner and which the Party agreed to pay to the Bank on his behalf has been fully expended, will you please note that it will not be possible for any further payment to be made to the Bank on his behalf from this end ?

Yours truly,

(M. R. MASANI)
General Secretary.

Enc : *

Thakur Bateshwar Prasad Singh, M.P.
Top Floor,
22, Chittaranjan Avenue,
CALCUTTA 13.