



EAST COAST RAILWAY

VIGILANCE WATCH

Avoiding Mistakes

CASE STUDY: IRREGULARITIES IN SUPPLY OF PARCEL VAN (VP)

Three merchants at a particular parcel office used to place indents (date-specific) for Parcel Vans for booking highly perishable iced fish. Unlike the first indenter 'A', the second and third indentors 'B' & 'C' were in habits of canceling the indents just before or shortly after the supply of parcel vans. The individual numbers of indents placed by these merchants, allotment given against their indents and the no. of indents cancelled by these merchants are as follows:

Merchant	Number of Indents Placed	Number of Parcel Vans Allotted	Number of Parcel Vans Loaded	Number of Indents cancelled after Allotment		% age of Indent cancelled after Allotment
				Before Placement	After Placement	
A	37	32	30	02	NIL	6.25
B	31	19	01	13	05	94.7
C	44	32	13	17	02	59.4

Random checks over a specific month revealed that in 90% of cases, just before the supply order was relayed by the control office against their indents, indentors 'B' and 'C' cancelled their respective indents. Needless to mention, the registration fees was a mere Rs500/- per indent and the demurrage charge @ Rs100/- per hour per parcel van.

Case-A: On 22.04.10, the division took over an empty parcel van, attached to a passenger train, which arrived at the concerned station at

2000hrs. On that day, the pending indent position of the particular station for the next few days was as follows:

Indent No. 45, dated 14.01.10, programmed to be despatched at 0800hrs of 23.04.10, placed by 'A'.

Indent No. 98, dated 21.04.10, programmed to be despatched at 0800hrs of 24.04.10, placed by 'B'.

Obviously, Indent No. 45 was the senior-most indent, against which the on-hand parcel van could have been allotted. However, the division did not take note of the arrival of the parcel van. Ultimately, Indent No. 45 was regretted on 23.04.10, citing that the VP could not be supplied on the intended day. And the VP, which had arrived at the concerned station a day before i.e. on 22.04.10, was detained for another day and finally allotted/supplied against Indent No. 98, placed by 'B', violating indent seniority.

Case-B: Again on 29.04.10, the division was handed over two parcel vans, which, by order of the zonal headquarters, were detached at the nearby Relief yard at 0300hrs. The pending indent position for the next few days for that particular station was as follows:

Indent No. 47, dated 18.01.10, programmed to be despatched at 1000hrs of 29.04.10, placed by 'A'

Indent No.106, dated 25.04.10, programmed to be despatched at 1300hrs of 29.04.10,

placed by 'C'

Indent No. 48, dated 18.01.10, programmed to be despatched at 0800hrs of 30.04.10, placed by 'A'

Indent No.108, dated 25.04.10, programmed to be despatched at 1200hrs of 30.04.10, placed by 'C'

Indent Nos. 47 & 48 were placed by 'A' and 106 & 108 by 'C'. The relief yard despatched one VP at 0900hrs of 29.04.10. Indent No. 47 was then regretted and the VP was allotted against Indent No. 106. The other VP came from relief yard at 0900hrs of 30.04.10. Indent No. 48 was then regretted and the second VP was supplied against Indent No.108, violating indent seniority.

Thus, despite having a VP on hand on 29.04.10, it was deliberately not supplied against Indent no. 47, which was the senior-most indent, placed by 'A'. And, if at all there existed operational constraints, for which the second VP could not be drawn out from the relief yard on 29.04.10, it could have been allotted against Indent No. 48, on 30.04.10. Moreover, Indentor 'A' was deprived twice by the division's rendering undue favour to 'C', in violation of provisions Chapter-II of IRCA Goods Tariff No-41 (Vol.-I).

Explanation of Control:

The explanation of the divisional control office was that they came to know the arrival of the VP at 1000hrs of 23.04.10 in the first case and at 1000hrs of 29.04.10 in the second case, only when the trains Clerk gave the yard position.

Deterrent D&A actions were taken against the concerned officers and staff of the division, as the explanation was far from satisfactory.

LESSONS LEARNT:

1. Promptness in collecting information and supply of Parcel Van in advance will help proper planning and allotment of the same.

Control Office, as per extant rules, must seek the load of a train, in tones and vehicles, at the time of taking over from the adjacent division/railway. This will help in planning effectively for mobilization of VPs. It should then act promptly, conveying allotment order, to get them optimally utilized. While efforts should be made to optimize the programmed movement, it must be ensured that none of the VPs on hand is idled without recording sufficient reasons.

2. Proper planning and their executions by operating control at divisional as well as at headquarters level, over the movement of the VPs are essential. There must be a thorough watch at the pending indents and the on hand VPs. In no case, the rule of indent seniority should be violated.
3. In compliance of directives of CVC on transparency, pending indent position and supply/allotment of VPs should be published and more importantly, updated frequently in the official website of the Railway.

Conduct Rule Reminder: Railway Board vide their letter No. E (D & A) 2007 / GS 1 - 1, dated 17.06.2009 have decided that in the context of acceptance of the recommendation of sixth Central Pay Commission, all supervisory staff working in PB-2 with Grade Pay of Rs4600 will now have to submit an Annual Return of their Immovable Property.