## SUMMARY REPORT OF DEO FOR EACH CONSTITUENCY ON LODGING OF ELECTION EXPENSES ACCOUNTS BY CANDIDATES

(a) No. and name of Assembly/Parliamentary Constituency:

014-Banswada Assembly Constituency

(b) Total No. of contesting candidates:

06

(c) State and District:

Andhra Pradesh - Nizamabad

(d) Date of declaration of result of election/bye-election:

17-10-2011 (Bye-election-2011)

(e) Last date of lodging accounts:

16-11-2011

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9		10		11
S. No	Name of the candidate	Due date of lodging of account	Date of lodging of account by the Candidate	Whether lodged in the prescribed format (Yes/No)	Whether lodged in the manner required by law (Yes/No)	Grand Total of the expenses incurred/ authorized by the candidate/ agent (as	Whether the DEO agrees with the amount shown by the candidate	Total expense by the party ( reported in pa Abstract State Lump sum Amount in	As art III of	incurred by others/entities as reported in part III of Abstract Statement.		Remarks of the Expenditure Observer.
						mentioned in part III Abstract Statement)	against all items of expenditur e.	cash or cheque given to candidate by each Political party	other expenses in kind by the Political Party	Lump Sum Amount in cash/cheq ue given to the candidate and mention names	Grand total of other expense s in kind incurred for the candida te	
1	Parige Srinivas Reddy (TRS)	16.11. 2011	11.11. 2011	Yes	Yes	4,50,625/-	No	15,00,000/	-		-	Vide his replies to the show cause notices dated 03/10/2011, 07/10/2011 and 11/10/2011, the candidate has given the following reasons for the discrepancy i) counting of his daughter's vehicle in the SOR ii) Excess rates applied in SOR in respect of meals, vehicles hire charges, mike charges, tarpaulins, chairs, flags, caps etc. iii) Non-use or lesser use of some vehicles that have been counted on full rates in the SOR The Dist. Election Officer has not accepted the candidate's

									explanation on all the above points. In absence of strong and verifiable supporting evidences in favour of the candidate's arguments, I agree with the Dist. Election Officer's estimate of the candidates expenditure. Since Rs. 3,58,000/- have been spent by the candidate in cash out of the total expenditure of Rs 4,50,625/-, the candidate's arguments do not stand on strong footing.
Srinivas Goud sangam (INC)	16.11. 2011	05.11. 2011	Yes	Yes	4,23,132/-	No			Discrepancy found as a result of the three inspections has been tried to be explained by the candidate vide his reply dated:05.11.2011 by stating that vehicle hire charges and meals charges have been taken in the SOR at value greater than the local market rate. In light of fact that all payments by the candidate were made in cash and no strong evidence has been given by him in support of his claim, the rates adopted by the DEO appear to be correct. Hence the expenditure of the candidate estimated as per the SOR, in my opinion is correct subject to the observation that the expenses of Rs 66,000/- added by the DEO as 'visit of political party leaders to Constituency' is not to be added because on rechecking it was found that the political party had submitted the list of Star Campaigners within the stipulated period of 7 days to the CEO/ECI.

3	Giridhar R (MTP)	16.11. 2011	11.11. 2011	Yes	Yes	1,32,186/-	No		32,650/-			The discrepancy of Rs 87,800/- has been admitted by the candidate vide his Lr. Dated:11.11.2011.
4	Kallepu Chandraiah (Indpt)	16.11. 2011	16.11. 2011	Yes	Yes	58,567/-	Yes	*	<b>(4)</b>	•	-	No discrepancy
5	Bhaskar Jajula (Indpt)	16.11. 2011	10.11. 2011	Yes	Yes	13,199/-	No	læ	A.	(9)	•	The discrepancy has not been explained by the candidate. Hence I agree with the DEO's estimate.
6	Sunil Kumar Venigalla (Indpt)	16.11. 2011	05.11- 2011	Yes	Yes	1,00,247/-	Yes	-		-		No discrepancy

Signature of the Expenditure Observer

Date:

To be forwarded to Election Commission of India through the Chief Electoral Officer of the concerned State.

21/4em 25/11/2011

Signature of the DEO

Signature of the CEO officer,

Prl. Secretary to Govt.,
General Administration Dept.