

7. TAX EVASION AND ENFORCEMENT ORGANISATIONS

Introduction

Enforcement of the sales tax, like that of any other tax, basically connotes securing obedience to the law in force. It does not, however, mean ruthless hammering by the enforcement authority nor does it imply a blind compliance with law. The most important function of enforcement is to see that the revenue legitimately due to the government comes to the exchequer in time. In doing so, the Enforcement Department has to deal with that section of the business community which tries to evade taxes. A clear understanding of the methods of evasion of tax and of the weaknesses in the present organisational structure of the Enforcement Wing as well as of its operations is necessary for suggesting ways of checking evasion of sales tax in the State. We examine in this chapter the modus operandi of evasion of sales tax at the outset and then present an empirical analysis of evasion of sales tax in the State. This is followed by an analysis of the existing organisational structure of the Enforcement Wing including checkposts. Finally, we present our suggestions for the reforms needed to check evasion of tax.

Modus Operandi of Evasion

Evasion of tax is of two types, viz., tax evasion on unrecorded transactions and that on recorded transactions. As the nomenclature suggests, under the former category tax is evaded by concealing the particular transactions of purchase or sale. These transactions are nowhere recorded in the books of accounts. On the other

hand, the latter category of evasion, that is, evasion in relation to recorded transactions means that the particular transactions are recorded by the dealer in the books of accounts but they are either shown as exempted or taxable at a lesser rate. Thus, these two categories could be termed as evasion of tax through suppression and through false claims, respectively.

Suppression of sales is generally practised by under-reporting of output and purchases. Normally, the output shown has to be commensurate with the use of inputs. To suppress the output, the dealer has to do the same with the inputs. But suppression of inputs (purchase) could be on account of under-reporting of imports or local purchases. In the case of the latter, it is obvious that another dealer within the State is also not reporting his sales. This could be done through a variety of ways. First, sales are effected without bills and are not accounted for. Secondly, more than one consignment of goods are transported under cover of one bill for the same quantity, i.e., the same bill is rotated more than once. Thirdly, the system of safe delivery is followed wherein the bills are initially issued to the buyer with or without making carbon copies. After the buyer intimates the seller about the safe delivery of the goods without any interruption, the seller makes entries for a negligible amount in the carbon copy, if it has not been made out already, or erases or alters the figures if a carbon copy has already been made out. The buyer, on the other hand, destroys the bills without accounting for the purchases. Fourthly, under-pricing or under-invoicing is resorted to. And, finally the bills of reputed firms are used. That

is, the dealer buys goods in small quantities from a reputed firm but alters the figures in the bills to claim second-sale exemptions of a larger quantity.

Evasion in relation to recorded transactions is attempted through false claims for exemptions often on account of alleged sales (a) of exempted goods, (b) goods bought from registered dealers, and (c) to registered dealers in other States. Examples of passing off taxable goods as exempted goods are cane jaggery passed off as palm-gur, coconut oil as palm oil and thattai as cholam. Similarly, agricultural commodities are passed off without payment of tax on the basis of declaration XXB. When such a declaration is used, original and duplicate copies should accompany the transport of goods and the triplicate is to be retained by the registered dealer. As a general practice, the original of the declaration is retained at the checkpost and the goods are allowed to pass under the cover of the duplicate copy of the declaration. Though all the three copies are expected to be filled in simultaneously, in practice, the dealer detaches the original and the duplicate, signs them without any details and sends them through the agent for securing such despatches. Thus, while the original and the duplicate have details of despatches, the triplicate is retained blank and filled up leisurely. After receiving the goods, the dealers alter the figures of quantum of bags, value, etc., or change the name of the commodities to exempted ones or do both and thereby evade the tax due.

Another method of evasion of tax is to record the first sale in the State (which is taxable) as the second sale. The principal dealer who really makes the first sale provides a bill purporting to show that he has purchased materials in question from another dealer in the State and, therefore, the sale in his hands is a second sale. Such bills produced for inspection during checking of accounts at the time of final assessment look like genuine bills; they bear the usual registration number, the name of the so-called first seller, his address and the sales tax supposed to have been paid at the point of first sale. On investigation, the first seller is often not traceable at all. The business address given is either non-existent, or is a place where no genuine business has ever been conducted in the past. When sometimes the person is discovered, he is found to be a man of no means, who by no stretch of imagination could have conducted any kind of business and from whom nothing at all can be recovered. Often he may be someone in the employ of the so-called second seller who is seeking exemption. Thus, the tax is evaded by the first-seller with the help of the bills sold by such persons known as "bill-traders". Evasion of tax through this method is found to exist in respect of all commodities liable to the first-stage single-point tax but especially in respect of stainless steel, chillies, oil seeds, oil, oil cake, and pulses.

In the case of oil seeds, oil, and oil cakes, for example, the modus operandi is as follows: A dealer owning an oil mill effects purchases of groundnut kernel from agriculturists. He does not record the purchases.

From the kernel he obtains the oil which he sells clandestinely. Since these persons are not able to dispose of the resultant oil cake immediately, as they could dispose of the oil, they obtain bills from bill-traders for the oil cake to make it appear as though the sales of oil cake by them are only second sales. Thus, they evade tax on the purchase of groundnut kernel, sale of oil, and of oil cake. When they are prepared to pay the tax on oil and oilcake, they obtain bills from bill-traders for kernel only. Often, another method is employed. The fact of purchase of groundnut is suppressed and the crushing is shown as "coolie-crushing", i.e., crushing on behalf of the agriculturist for a fee.

The above type of evasion starts with the evasion of purchase tax. In respect of most other commodities, bill-trading occurs in relation to inputs from the other States or is coupled with the suppression of the fact of local manufacture by another dealer. A variety of ways are employed to 'smuggle' goods into the State. If the trucks carrying the goods are to pass through checkpoints, they, i.e., the goods are miss-classified or under-reported in the invoice; or the goods are shown to be in transit with the destination being in another State. To avoid the checkpoints altogether, goods are sent by rail, the R.R. is endorsed to some third party who takes delivery, and then the goods are not traceable. Yet another favourite method of bringing goods from outside is for itinerant traders to bring them as personal baggage by train and dispose of them quickly. Subsequent sales within the State may be off the records or they may become subject to bill-trading.

Another method of evasion of tax is to under-value the sales turnover by under-invoicing. If the sales at the taxable point are shown in the invoices for a much lesser quantity, then tax liability on the entire chain of transactions in respect of such goods gets reduced. This happens specially in the case of manufacturers of products who sell the commodities to closely related persons or a subsidiary or an associated concern at prices much lower than the market prices. These intermediaries in turn sell the goods at a price much higher than the first-sale price.

The other methods of evasion include avoidance of tax on inter-State transactions under the guise of stock transfer and evasion of tax under the guise of work order.

Estimates of Evasion of Sales Tax

One of the earliest estimates of sales tax evasion was presented by Prof. P.S. Lokanathan (Lokanathan, 1963) for Andhra Pradesh for the years 1960-61 to 1961-62. He showed that about 68 per cent of the turnover escaped tax in 10 major agricultural commodities (Table 7.1). Following Prof. Lokanathan, who adopted the production method, in recent years various Committees and Study Teams have attempted estimates on similar lines. The Study Team of the NIPFP (NIPFP, 1981), followed this methodology for estimating the evasion of sales tax in Bihar in respect of two commodities, viz., automobile parts and potato (Tables 7.2-3). Later, the Gujarat Taxation Enquiry Commission, 1980 (Government of Gujarat, 1980), and the Uttar Pradesh Taxation Enquiry Committee, 1980

TABLE 7.1

Estimates of Net Domestic Marketable Surplus of Important Agricultural Commodities in Andhra Pradesh (1959-60)

| Commodity | Unit | Production | | Seeds and wastage (12%) | | Available for consumption (Col. 1-2) | | Non-monotized consumption (12%) | | Domestic marketable surplus | |
|--------------------|---------------------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| | | Quantity | Value (Rs '000) | Quantity | Value (Rs '000) | Quantity | Value (Rs '000) | Quantity | Value (Rs '000) | Quantity | Value (Rs '000) |
| | | (1) | (2) | (2) | | (3) | | (4) | | (5) | |
| Rice | In metric tons | 37,75,010 | 2,26,07,58 | 4,71,876 | 28,87,88 | 33,03,134 | 197,19,69 | 10,57,002 | 64,66,85 | 2,246 | 1,33,50,84 |
| Pulses | " " " | 2,62,000 | 11,97,79 | 3,27,50 | 1,49,72 | 2,29,250 | 10,48,07 | 73,360 | 3,35,36 | 1,55,890 | 7,12,64 |
| Millets | " " " | 8,00,000 | 32,13,38 | 1,00,000 | 4,01,67 | 7,00,000 | 28,11,72 | 4,90,000 | 19,67,65 | 210 | 8,44,07 |
| Groundnuts | " " " | 7,54,000 | 41,34,75 | 94,250 | 5,16,84 | 6,59,750 | 36,17,91 | - | - | 6,50,750 | 36,17,91 |
| Chillies | " " " | 80,000 | 17,88,80 | 10,000 | 2,23,60 | 70,000 | 15,65,20 | - | - | 70,000 | 15,65,20 |
| Cocoanuts | Nos. | 30,59,89,900 | 8,61,36 | 3,82,48,738 | 1,07,67 | 26,77,41,162 | 7,53,69 | - | - | 26,77,41,162 | 7,53,69 |
| Jute | (Hests Bales of 400 lbs.) | 2,87,120 | 4,07,71 | 35,890 | 50,96 | 2,31,230 | 3,56,75 | - | - | 2,31,230 | 3,56,75 |
| Turneric | In metric tons | 25,486 | 2,06,73 | 3,186 | 26,09 | 22,300 | 1,82,64 | - | - | 22,300 | 1,82,64 |
| Cotton | Bales of 392 lbs. | 35,780 | 3,46,72 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 95,180 | 3,46,72 |
| Jaggery | In metric tons | 6,82,930 | 39,95,14 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 6,82,930 | 39,95,14 |
| TOTAL value | | | 387,61,96 | | 43,64,43 | | 300,55,67 | | 57,71,88 | | 2,57,25,65 |

| 'Inventories and hoarding 20 per cent of domestic marketable surplus' | | Estimated net domestic marketable surplus | | Turnover assessed to tax | Turnover assessed as a per cent of domestic marketable surplus | Sales tax realized | Ideal yield sales tax based on column |
|---|-----------------|---|-----------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Quantity | Value (Rs '000) | Quantity | Value (Rs '000) | (Rs '000) | (per cent) | (Rs '000) | (Rs '000) |
| (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) | | |
| 4,49,226 | 26,70,1 | 17,96,906 | 1,06,80,67 | 58,41,103 | 54,68 | 1,72,68 | 4,27,23 |
| 31,178 | 1,42,55 | 2,24,712 | 5,70,15 | 4,32,32 | 75,60 | 9,00 | 11,40 |
| 15,200 | 3,82,39 | 1,14,800 | 4,61,68 | 72,89 | 15,78 | 1,47 | 9,23 |
| - | - | 6,59,750 | 36,17,91 | 7,28,79 | 20,7 | 14,01 | 72,36 |
| - | - | 70,000 | 15,65,20 | 56,73 | 3,62 | 1,02 | 31,30 |
| - | - | 26,77,41,162 | 7,53,69 | 90,54 | 12,01 | 2,64 | 15,07 |
| - | - | 2,31,230 | 3,56,75 | 1,91,72 | 53,74 | 56 | 7,13 |
| - | - | 22,300 | 1,82,64 | 1,67,91 | 91,93 | 7,59 | 10,96 |
| - | - | 95,780 | 3,46,72 | 2,15,73 | 62,21 | 3,11 | 6,93 |
| - | - | 6,82,930 | 39,95,14 | 6,74,55 | 16,89 | 17,96 | 1,19,85 |
| | 31,95,11 | | 2,25,30,54 | 84,72,51 | | 2,30,05 | 7,11,46 |

Source : P.S. Loknathan (1963), Sales Tax System in Andhra Pradesh, ICARR, New Delhi.

TABLE 7.2

Estimate of Extent of Evasion in Potato Trade in Bihar
by Different Methods

(Average for Five Years 1971-72 to 1975-76)

| Method of evasion/ avoidance | Loss of revenue (Rs lakh) average for five years 1971-72 to 1975-76 | Percentage loss (loss of revenue as per cent of potential tax revenue |
|---|--|---|
| Under-reporting the prices | 66.35 | 50.9 |
| Suppression of transactions by cold storage owners | 32.60 | 25.0 |
| Other methods | 14.29 | 11.0 |
| Actual tax revenue | 17.14 | 13.1 |
| Potential tax revenue | 130.38 | 100.0 |

Source: NIPFP (1981), Sales Tax System
in Bihar, Somaiya Publications,
Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.

TABLE 7.2

Estimate of Extent of Evasion in Potato Trade in Bihar
by Different Methods

(Average for Five Years 1971-72 to 1975-76)

| Method of evasion/ avoidance | Loss of revenue (Rs lakh) average for five years 1971-72 to 1975-76 | Percentage loss (loss of revenue as per cent of potential tax revenue) |
|---|--|--|
| Under-reporting the prices | 66.35 | 50.9 |
| Suppression of transactions by cold storage owners | 32.60 | 25.0 |
| Other methods | 14.29 | 11.0 |
| Actual tax revenue | 17.14 | 13.1 |
| Potential tax revenue | 130.38 | 100.0 |

Source: NIPFP (1981), Sales Tax System
in Bihar, Somaiya Publications,
Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.

TABLE 7.3

Sales Tax Potential of Motor Parts in Bihar
(1972-73 to 1977-78)

| Year | Estimated tax base | Estimated tax potential | Actual taxable turnover | Tax revenue collected | Tax revenue as a propor- tion of tax potential Cols. 4 \div 2 (per cent) |
|---------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| 1972-73 | 647.63 | 98.83 | 572.16 | 50.57 | 51.17 |
| 1973-74 | 947.71 | 145.25 | 550.18 | 50.52 | 34.78 |
| 1974-75 | 873.11 | 135.64 | 685.45 | 60.99 | 44.96 |
| 1975-76 | 1021.95 | 187.31 | 821.17 | 88.75 | 47.38 |
| 1976-77 | 1316.17 | 225.72 | 1170.57 | 107.05 | 47.43 |
| 1977-78 | 2102.74 | 362.28 | 1411.93 | 129.12 | 35.64 |

Source: As in Table 7.2

(Government of Uttar Pradesh, 1980) also made attempts to estimate the extent of evasion in respect of a few commodities (Tables 7.4-6). Earlier, such an approach was adopted by the Kerala Committee on Commodity Taxation (Government of Kerala, 1976) (Tables 7.7-8), and the Uttar Pradesh Taxation Enquiry Committee (Government of Uttar Pradesh, 1974) (Table 7.9), both of which selected some major commodities for estimation of evasion of tax. The estimates of evasion of sales tax prepared by the above Committees bring out the fact that the evasion of tax on various commodities varies from a very meagre ratio of 5 per cent to a very large proportion of 85 per cent of tax due, depending upon the nature of the commodity.

Attempts have been made to estimate the evasion of the sales tax as a whole in a State. The methods employed to quantify such evasion include the adoption of the consumption approach, using a regression model, or estimating on the basis of the growth of some proxy variables. The method of estimating evasion on the basis of consumer expenditure was, for the first time, made use of by consumer expenditure and Resource Enquiry Committee (Government of Mysore, 1969), but it found the estimates to be far from reliable. A multiple regression model with a few explanatory variables (such as per capita income, per capita value added by manufacture, and the degree of urbanisation) was used by the National Council of Applied Economic Research for the study of the sales tax system in Andhra Pradesh (NCAER, 1971). The Kerala Taxation Enquiry Committee (Government of Kerala, 1976), estimated evasion by taking a base year and then working

TABLE 7.4

Potential Yield of Sales Tax on Groundnut
in Gujarat
(1977-78)

(Rs crore)

| Sl. No. | Particular | Results based on | |
|---------|-----------------------------------|------------------|---------------|
| | | Minimum price | Average price |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| 1. | Total production | 303.68 | 332.15 |
| 2. | Deductions | | |
| 2.1 | Seeds used in sowing | 64.64 | 70.70 |
| 2.2 | Consignment sales (average value) | 7.55 | 7.55 |
| 2.3 | Export (average value) | 14.17 | 14.17 |
| | Total deductions | 86.36 | 92.42 |
| 3. | Sales liable to tax (1-2) | 217.32 | 239.73 |
| 4. | Out of total sales estimated | | |
| a) | Local sales | 214.86 | 237.27 |
| b) | Inter-State sales | 2.46 | 2.46 |
| 5. | Sales tax yield estimates | 9.21 | 10.17 |

Source : Government of Gujarat (1980),
Report of the Gujarat Taxation
Enquiry Commission, Gandhi
Nagar.

TABLE 7.5

Estimates of Evasion of Sales Tax on Groundnut
(1977-78)

(Rs crore)

| Price | Sales tax potential | Sales tax receipts based on sales tax record | Difference | Column (4) as per cent of column (2) |
|------------------|------------------------|--|------------|--|
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| Minimum price | 9.21 | 7.57 | 1.64 | 17.81 |
| Average price | 10.17 | | 2.60 | 25.56 |

Source: As in Table 7.4.

TABLE 7.6

Taxation of Copra and Coconut Oil in Kerala: Potential
and Actual Realisation

(Rs crore)

| Year | Coconut and copra | | | Coconut oil | | |
|---------|-------------------|------------|-------------------------|------------------|------------|-------------------------|
| | Taxable turnover | Tax levied | Estimated tax potential | Taxable turnover | Tax levied | Estimated tax potential |
| 1968-69 | 30.64 | 0.61 | 2.12 | 16.06 | 0.43 | 1.37 |
| 1969-70 | 30.52 | 0.86 | 2.53 | 22.32 | 0.44 | 2.45 |
| 1970-71 | 32.64 | 0.96 | 3.56 | 61.38 | 1.38 | 3.42 |
| 1971-72 | 59.09 | 1.57 | 2.94 | 91.30 | 2.06 | 4.31 |
| 1972-73 | 72.93 | 1.86 | 3.10 | 85.28 | 2.98 | 3.36 |

Source: Government of Kerala (1976),
Report of the Committee on
Commodity Taxation,
Trivandrum.

TABLE 7.7

Value of Production, Taxable Turnover and Tax Levied
in Respect of Rubber in Kerala

| Year | Estimated production (tonnes) | Average price (per cent) | Estimated value of production (Rs crore) | Value of taxable turnover (Rs crore) | Tax levied (Rs crore) |
|---------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------|
| 1968-69 | 66,473 | 5,079 | 33.76 | 20.29 | 0.41 |
| 1969-70 | 76,897 | 4,739 | 36.44 | 23.53 | 0.49 |
| 1970-71 | 78,731 | 4,583 | 35.08 | 25.71 | 0.78 |
| 1971-72 | 88,929 | 4,255 | 37.84 | 18.33 | 0.58 |
| 1972-73 | 91,948 | 4,543 | 41.77 | 31.51 | 0.99 |
| 1973-74 | 1,18,020 | 4,577 | 54.21 | 31.09 | 0.98 |

Source: As in Table 7.6.

TABLE 7.8

Marketable Surplus Taxable Turnover and Tax Levied in
Respect of Arecanut in Kerala

| Year | Estimated marketable surplus (Rs crore) | Taxable turnover (Rs crore) | Column (3) as per cent of col. (2) | Tax levied (Rs crore) |
|---------|--|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| 1968-69 | 32.01 | 13.32 | 41.6 | 0.77 |
| 1969-70 | 36.31 | 23.28 | 64.1 | 1.22 |
| 1970-71 | 32.94 | 31.52 | 95.7 | 1.65 |
| 1971-72 | 29.96 | 34.00 | 126.1 | 1.77 |
| 1972-73 | 22.73 | 13.25 | 58.3 | 0.70 |
| 1973-74 | 28.94 | 16.74 | 44.0 | 0.88 |

Source: As in Table 7.6.

TABLE 7.9

Actual Sales Tax Receipts as Percentage of Potential Tax Base in Uttar Pradesh
for the Years 1965-66 and 1969-70

| Name of the commodity | 1965-66 | | 1969-70 | | Actual tax Receipts as percentage of potential tax base 1965-66 1969-70 | |
|--|------------------|--|------------------|--|---|------|
| | Expected revenue | Actual receipts under UP sales tax act | Expected revenue | Actual receipts under UP sales tax act | | |
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| Aata, maida and suji | 5232 | 2651 | 4921 | 3513 m | 50.7 | 71.4 |
| Ghee deshi | 4045 | 1810 | 3661 | 1203 | 44.7 | 32.9 |
| Kerosene oil | 41520 | 6976 | 16896 | 13160 | 16.8 | 77.9 |
| Medicines | 4787 | 5025 | 22084 | 8185 | 105.0 | 37.1 |
| Matches | 2858 | 2067 | 4002 | 3330 | 72.3 | 83.2 |
| (All of all kinds other than vanaspati | 13847 | 4292 | NA | 6560 | 31.0 | NA |
| Pea | 2697 | 2304 | 9412 | 6016 | 85.4 | 63.9 |
| Oil seeds | NA | NA | 182833 | 9920 | NA | 54.0 |
| Cement | 11115 | 6029 | 20150 | 13295 | 54.2 | 66.0 |
| Iron and steel | 15334 | 9849 | 42071 | 19314 | 64.2 | 45.9 |
| Cotton yarn | 4805 | 4410 | NA | NA | 91.8 | NA |
| Textile goods | 3988 | 1547 | 4006 | 2996 | 38.8 | 74.8 |
| Paper | 2944 | 307 | 2093 | 579 | 10.4 | 27.7 |
| Cardboard and straw-board | 589 | 108 | 323 | 235 | 18.3 | 72.8 |
| TOTAL | 113761 | 47375 | 148002 | 88306 | 41.6 | 59.7 |

Source : Government of Uttar Pradesh, (1974), Uttar Pradesh Taxation Enquiry Committee Report, Lucknow.

out the potential growth in tax revenue as a result of the growth in the explanatory variables (Table 7.10). Such estimates may not be very useful from the practical angle, but certainly help to provide a rough idea as to what extent in a particular State the tax yield falls short of its potential because of evasion.

As in other States, in Tamil Nadu too, the extent of evasion varies from one commodity to another. There are commodities like cement and petrol which can be said to suffer from little evasion of tax. There are others like chillies, edible oil and stainless steel articles where the evasion is substantial; potential tax even at one stage is not recovered fully (Table 7.11). Empirical estimates of evasion of sales tax attempted by the Commercial Taxes Department, Tamil Nadu, for the year 1969-70, reveal that evasion was to the extent of 21 per cent in the case of grams and pulses, 25 per cent in chillies, 53 per cent in oil and 81 per cent in tamarind (Government of Tamil Nadu, 1974).

The Study Team of the NIPFP conducted a commodity flow survey in regard to the commodities, selected in consultation with the Commissioner of Commercial Taxes. One of the commodities chosen for the survey was groundnuts including groundnut oil (representing agricultural produce) and the other commodity was automobile parts (representing industrial output). The results of the survey are presented in Annexure VII.1. It is seen that evasion was in the range of 40 to 50 per cent of the potential tax revenue.

TABLE 7.10

A Comparison of Actual Sales Tax Performance in Kerala with the Estimated Potential

| Year | Total revenue from sales tax (Rs crore) | Sales taxes at 1968-69 levels of taxation excluding additional taxation (Rs crore) | Index of income from trade sector at constant prices | Estimated sales tax at 1968-69 prices (Rs crore) | Price index in respect of commodities sub-jected to sales taxation | Estimated sales tax potential at current prices (Col.4 X Col.5/100) (Rs crore) | Sales tax potential including additional taxation (Rs crore) | Short-fall (Col.7 - Col.1) (Rs. crore) | Percentage short-fall |
|--------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----------------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
| 1968-69 | 29.0 | 29.0 | 100 | 29.0 | 100 | 29.0 | - | - | 10.0 |
| 1969-70 | 32.5 | 31.8 | 109 | 31.6 | 112 | 35.4 | 36.1 | 3.6 | 9.8 |
| 1970-71 | 37.6 | 35.9 | 118 | 34.2 | 117 | 40.7 | 41.7 | 4.1 | 8.4 |
| 1971-72 | 42.4 | 37.8 | 119 | 34.5 | 121 | 41.7 | 46.3 | 3.9 | 17.6 |
| 1972-73 | 46.0 | 39.2 | 130 | 37.7 | 130 | 49.0 | 55.8 | 9.8 | 31.2 |
| 1973-74 | 53.4 | 45.9 | 143 | 41.5 | 169 | 70.1 | 77.6 | 24.2 | 17.7 |
| Total for years, | | | | | | | | | |
| 1969-70 to 1973-74 | 211.9 | 190.6 | - | 179.5 | - | 236.2 | 257.5 | 45.6 | 32.2 |
| 1974-75 | 76.0 | 68.0 | 157 | 45.5 | 229 | 104.2 | 112.2 | 36.2 | 20.6 |
| 1975-76 | 97.6 | - | 167 | 48.4 | 236 | 114.2 | 122.2 | 25.2 | |

Source : As in Table 7.6.

TABLE 7.11

Quantification of Sales Tax Evasion on the Sales of Some Selected Commodities in
(1969-70)

| Sl. No. | Commodity | Quantity available for sale (tonnes) | Whole-sale price per tonne (on September 1969) | Value | Sales tax revenue potential at one stage | Actual revenue collected from all stages of sale | Short-fall of revenue Col. (5) - Col. (6) | Percentage of evasion |
|---------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---------|--|--|---|-----------------------|
| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | |
| 1. | Chillies | 82000 | 5200 | 4264.00 | 127.92 | 96.00 | 31.92 | 24.95 |
| 2. | Tamarind | 110340 | 1500 | 1656.45 | 49.69 | 9.30 | 40.39 | 81.28 |
| 3. | Grams and pulses | 331660 | 1250 | 4145.75 | 124.37 | 98.12 | 26.25 | 21.11 |
| 4. | Groundnut oil | 184094 | 5000 | 9204.70 | | | | |
| 5. | Groundnut oil cake | 230117 | 750 | 1725.88 | | | | |
| 6. | Gingelly oil | 22663 | 5000 | 1133.15 | | | | |
| 7. | Gingelly oil cake | 28329 | 1000 | 283.29 | 370.41 | 174.81 | 195.60 | 52.81 |

Source: Government of Tamil Nadu, (1974), Rationa-
lisation and Simplification of Commercial
Taxes Acts and Rules, Report by
S.P. Srinivasan, (mimeo) p. 167.

TABLE 7.12

Quantification of Sales Tax Evasion in Different Years

(Rs crore)

| Year | Potential revenue from sales tax | Actual yield from sales tax | Short-fall of revenue | Percentage of evasion |
|---------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1970-71 | 36.44 | 33.07 | 3.37 | 9.3 |
| 1971-72 | 39.99 | 35.89 | 4.10 | 10.3 |
| 1972-73 | 44.00 | 36.51 | 7.49 | 17.0 |
| 1973-74 | 67.44 | 42.23 | 25.21 | 26.5 |
| 1974-75 | 61.76 | 58.26 | 3.50 | 5.7 |
| 1975-76 | 63.46 | 57.24 | 6.22 | 9.8 |

Source : Government of Tamil Nadu, (1979), Report of the Tamil Nadu Sales Tax Committee, 1977, Government of Tamil Nadu, Madras, p. 25

TABLE 7.13

Estimation of Sales Tax Evasion in Different Commodities Under GST Act

| | Bicalyptus oil/ 1975-76 | 1976-77 | Rubber (Latex) 1976-77 | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 | 1980-81 |
|--|----------------------------|----------|------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Total marketable production (Kg. '000) | 1224.00 | 1224.00 | 5676.55 | 796925.00 | 774001.00 | 849382.00 | 773101.00 | 816232.00 | 642040.00 |
| Total IMGST taxable turnover (Rs '000) | 18360.00 | 18360.00 | 19049.57 ^{1/2} | 1269500.00 | 1404500.00 | 1192900.00 | 979100.00 ^{2/} | 1565200.00 ^{2/} | 1993300.00 ^{2/} |
| Estimated tax revenue (Rs '000) | 734.40 | 734.40 | 952.48 | 63475.00 | 70225.00 | 43735.00 | 29379.00 | 46956.00 | 59799.00 |
| Actual revenue (Rs '000) | 275.69 | 343.86 | 201.99 | 27333.00 | 34171.00 | 20325.00 | 20000.00 | 30000.00 | 40000.00 |
| Tax evasion (Rs '000) | 458.71 | 390.54 | 750.49 | 36142.00 | 36054.00 | 23414.00 | 9373.00 | 16956.00 | 19799.00 |
| Tax revenue as a proportion of tax potential (per cent) | 37.54 | 46.82 | 21.21 | 43.06 | 48.66 | 46.47 | 68.08 | 63.89 | 66.89 |

Note 1. * 3 per cent multi-point

1/ Nilgiris (District)

2/ Kanyakumari (District)

3/ Whole State

4/ Taxable turnover determined by the assessing authority

Source: Government of Tamil Nadu,
Commercial Taxes Department,
Madras.

In addition to the commodity-flow surveys, we have attempted estimation of evasion of sales tax at macro-level as well. That is to say, we have attempted estimation of evasion of the tax for the whole of the State. For this purpose, we have assumed that the turnover would be affected by changes in the income originating from the trade sector (Y_t). Hence, we have related tax revenue changes to the variations in the Y_t . And to segregate the effect of changes in the prices of the commodities exempted from the tax, we have applied a new price index got prepared for this purpose. The position is set out in Table 7.14. It could be seen from the results that the difference between the potential yield (col. 8) and the actual revenue (col.1) gives the evasion of sales tax (col. 9). Strictly speaking, this exercise is indicative of only the increase of evasion of sales tax over the base period because we cannot assume that there was no evasion of sales tax in the base year. It can be seen from the data that, on an average, the State has been able to capture 80 per cent to 90 per cent of the potential tax base during the period 1974-75 to 1979-80.^{1/} However, in the year 1977-78, the gap between the actual and the potential tax was much greater; the shortfall in that year amounted to 24 per cent. Thus, the study shows that the minimum amount of evasion of the tax is of the magnitude of 10 to 20 per cent in all the years.

^{1/} Assuming that in the base year actual collection = potential.

TABLE 7.14

A Comparison of Actual Sales Tax Performance of the State with the Estimated Potential

| Year | General sales taxes (net) | Additional tax assessed | Hypothetical sales tax revenue at 1974-75 base | Index of income from trade sector at constant 1974-75 prices (per cent) | Estimated sales tax potential at 1974-75 prices | Price index in respect of commodities subjected to sales taxes (per cent) | Estimated sales tax potential including additional taxation | Short-fall of tax collection | Short-fall as percentage of potential tax (per cent) |
|---------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 1974-75 | 15153.28 | 1326.00 | 15153.28 | 100.00 | 15153.28 | 100.00 | 15153.28 | - | - |
| 1975-76 | 16458.25 | 350.00 | 16108.25 | 116.89 | 17712.67 | 103.22 | 18283.02 | 2174.77 | 11.67 |
| 1976-77 | 16972.21 | - | 16611.28 | 115.63 | 17521.74 | 115.86 | 20300.69 | 3717.11 | 17.97 |
| 1977-78 | 18045.03 | - | 17661.27 | 129.52 | 19626.53 | 118.75 | 23306.50 | 5707.66 | 24.03 |
| 1978-79 | 22112.00 | 450.00 | 21171.98 | 142.83 | 21643.43 | 128.54 | 27820.46 | 6721.04 | 23.31 |
| 1979-80 | 26307.32 | 205.00 | 24992.66 | 139.68 | 21166.10 | 147.07 | 31128.99 | 6199.67 | 18.97 |

Note : 1/ General sales tax including sales tax on motor spirit and purchase tax on sugarcane.

2/ Proportional adjustment method has been used to compute hypothetical tax series.

4. Organisation of Enforcement Wing

From the estimates presented above it is clear that the administration of the tax calls for an effective Enforcement Wing. In Tamil Nadu, there exists an Enforcement Wing. Its present form dates from May 2, 1979, when it was reorganised.

Prior to this, there was an Intelligence Wing under the control of the Deputy Commissioner (Intelligence), with headquarters at Madras. The Wing was sub-divided into three units, namely, the Central Intelligence Unit, the Commercial Taxes Intelligence Unit, and the District Intelligence Unit. The first unit functioned under the direct control of the Deputy Commissioner (Intelligence), while the other units were under the control of the respective Assistant Commissioners (Intelligence). In addition, there was an Assistant Commissioner heading the Inter-State Investigation Cell which was attached to the Office of the Deputy Commissioner (Intelligence) and had its headquarters at Madras.

The existing Enforcement Wing consists of two Divisions, namely, Madurai Division and Madras Division. Each Division is controlled by an Officer drawn from the IAS cadre. Madras Division consists of 15 districts and is managed by four Assistant Commissioners. Madurai Division comprises 11 districts and is managed by two Assistant Commissioners. In addition, there is a Central Enforcement Wing which is a specialised agency managed by persons picked up specially for their proven integrity and efficiency. These Officers are entrusted with tasks

which involve State-wide investigation and are complicated in nature. This Wing thus has jurisdiction throughout the State to serve the purpose of a pocket force. There are three groups in the Central Enforcement Wing, each headed by a Commercial Tax Officer and assisted by two Deputy Commercial Tax Officers and two Assistant Commercial Tax Officers. The overall work of this Wing is supervised by the Deputy Commissioner (Enforcement), Madras.

The functions of the Enforcement Wing include shop inspection, test purchase, lorry check, and extract verification. The Officers of the Enforcement Wing are also in charge of prevention of bill-trading and conducting raids on the dealers of select commodities. The administration of the checkposts also falls under the purview of the Enforcement Wing and these are managed by an Assistant Commissioner.

With a view to preventing misuse of the exemption granted to stock transfers and to checking evasion of tax, the Enforcement wing has under it an independent Inter-State Investigation Cell. It consists of one Assistant Commissioner and two Deputy Commercial Tax Officers. The Cell has been examining cases involving inter-State sales, branch transfers, depot sales and consignment sales to other States. In this process, the Cell gathers factual information to ascertain the claims of exempted sales. Besides, the Cell gathers extracts of transactions allowed as exempted and conducts preliminary investigations and inspection within the State.

Checkposts

Effective checking of evasion of the first-point tax requires, among other things, efficient ways of monitoring the flow of goods into the State through the main arteries of inter-State trade. Checkposts have been considered to be the proper means of keeping track of the movement of taxable goods into the State. Thus, checkposts have been in existence in Tamil Nadu since 1959 when the first-point tax was introduced as per the recommendations of Dr. P.S. Lokanathan (NCAER, 1965). As the Department found the checkposts to be useful in checking evasion of tax, their number was increased over time: from 13 in 1963 they were increased to 70 in 1973. Today there are 75 checkposts in the State.

The checkposts are located either at the border of the State or in the vicinity of some important towns. The former could be termed border checkposts, and the latter internal checkposts. Presently, there are about 22 border checkposts. The rest of the 53 checkposts - the internal checkposts - are around Madras, Madurai, Coimbatore, Kanyakumari, Virudhunagar, Tiruchirapalli, etc. (See Map of Tamil Nadu, p. 159). These checkposts aim to ring the towns or monitor inter-State movement of goods. However, some of the internal checkposts have been established to check the diversion of vehicles from the main road. These checkposts are regulatory in nature and have only an indirect effect on the transporters; normally not much traffic is seen to pass through these checkposts.

TAMIL NADU COMMERCIAL TAXES-CHECK POSTS

25 50 km



INDIAN OCEAN

The importance of the checkpoints, however, lies in the fact that the documents received by these posts help the Department to monitor the flow of goods. This enables it to get valuable information to check the evasion of the tax. The procedure of getting and utilising the information stemming from the checkpoints is as follows: The documents received by the checkpoints are sent to the Assistant Commissioner (Administration) for onward transmission to the Enforcement Wing. The personnel of this Wing are expected to verify the genuineness or otherwise of the transactions indicated by the documents. After verification, the information is to be transmitted to the concerned assessing authorities so that it can be made use of at the time of assessment. In this way, the assessing authority is given an independent source of information regarding the transactions of the assessee under him. At the same time, any irregularities detected by the Enforcement Wing would also be passed on to the assessing authority; in suitable cases the Enforcement Wing itself may take action, such as collecting advance tax or imposing penalty.

Performance of the Enforcement Wing

A comparison of the performance of the erstwhile Intelligence Wing and the existing Enforcement Wing reveals interesting facts (Table 7.15). First, the number of shop-inspections conducted during the period 1977-78 to 1979-80 show considerable increase. Shop inspections during 1977-78 numbered 4,186 but increased

TABLE 7.15

Performance of the Enforcement Wing

| | 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 |
|--|---------|---------|---------|
| <u>1. Shop Inspection</u> | | | |
| i) No. of shops inspected | 4186 | 4401 | 12150 |
| ii) No. of test purchases made | 2253 | 2538 | 3319 |
| iii) No. of extracts verified | 2029 | 1858 | 4785 |
| <u>2. No. of Offences Compounded</u> | | | |
| i) Under shop inspections | 2778 | 2593 | 8260 |
| ii) Under test purchases | 889 | 1130 | 1440 |
| iii) Under extract verifications | 225 | 116 | 165 |
| <u>3. Suppressions Detected (Rs lakh)</u> | | | |
| i) Turnover suppressed | 4608 | 4065 | 5991 |
| ii) Tax and penalty | 343 | 298 | 502 |
| <u>4. Compounding Fees Collected</u> | | | |
| i) Under shop inspections (Rs lakh) | 7.39 | 7.51 | 36.68 |
| ii) Under test purchases (Rs lakh) | 0.89 | 1.04 | 1.49 |
| iii) Under extract verifications (Rs lakh) | 1.42 | 11.77 | 7.48 |
| <u>5. Number of Vehicles Checked</u> | | | |
| i) At the checkpoints | 5326264 | 4843501 | 5353481 |
| ii) Outside the checkpoints | 11134 | 30867 | 96617 |
| <u>6. Number of Offences Booked</u> | | | |
| i) At the checkpoints | 3567 | 23703 | 32106 |
| ii) Outside the checkpoints | 764 | 1597 | 6541 |
| <u>7. Composition Fees and Tax Collected (Rs lakh)</u> | | | |
| i) At the checkpoints | 29.41 | 36.00 | 68.96 |
| ii) Outside the checkpoints | 1.08 | 3.66 | 15.85 |

Source: Government of Tamil Nadu,
Commercial Taxes Department,
Madras.

roughly by three times in the year 1979-80.^{1/} Commensurate with the increase in the shop inspections, the yield from the compounding fee also shot up from Rs 7.39 lakh to Rs.36.68 lakh during the same period. Secondly, the percentage of cases in which offences were compounded, did not materially change but the test purchases by the Enforcement Wing revealed substantial progress. Also, the number of cases in which offences were booked went up and the compounding fee showed an increase during the period. Thirdly, the number of verifications has more than doubled during the period and the compounding fee went up by five times. Contrary to the increase in the number of verifications, the percentage of verifications in which offences were compounded declined. Finally, the revenue through the levy of tax on evaded turnover and penalty thereon have also shown a rapid increase.

The above analysis of the performance of the Enforcement Wing includes that of the checkpoints. But an analysis of the contribution of the checkpoints alone is also revealing. Whereas the number of checkpoints in the State remained constant during the years 1979-80 to 1980-81 (the period for which data relating to checkpoints are available), the total number of vehicles passing through the checkpoints has declined from 52.95 lakh in

^{1/} Here, it is important to note that the work of inspection prior to the reorganisation was duplicated by the Intelligence Wing and the Assessment Wing. To this extent, the number of inspections during the two periods are not strictly comparable.

1979-80 to 50.65 lakh in 1980-81 (Table 7.16), due to the fall in the number of vehicles passing through the internal checkpoints only (the reasons for the latter are not known). Notwithstanding this fall, the volume of detection of suppression of turnover as well as the collection of compounding fee through the checkpoints has increased over the years.

An important activity of the Enforcement Wing is to indicate cases of suppression of tax and to point out the modus operandi of evasion of tax so that either the structure of the tax or the administrative procedures could be amended accordingly. Information relating to this activity of the Enforcement Wing is normally not made available through published data. However, the report for Madras Division for the year 1979-80 made available to the Study Team indicates the following:

| Line of trade | (Rs lakh) | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| | Number of detected cases | Revenue effect |
| Stainless steel goods | 4 | 10.62 |
| Tractor parts | 1 | 0.64 |
| Commission agents | 2 | 3.40 |
| Hides and skins | 7 | 2.83 |
| Chemical | 1 | 1.00 |
| Hotels | 2 | 1.50 |

The above data show that the Enforcement Wing raised the highest revenue from articles of stainless steel, whereas the number of the detected cases were only four. Conversely,

TABLE 7.16

Physical Performance of Checkposts in Tamil Nadu

| | 1979-80 | | | 1980-81 | | | (Number) |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| | Border | Internal | Total | Border | Internal | Total | |
| Checkposts | 22 | 53 | 75 | 22 | 53 | 75 | |
| Vehicles that have passed through checkposts | 13,30,410 | 39,65,100 | 52,95,510 | 13,63,384 | 36,99,197 | 50,65,581 | |
| Cases in which defects were noticed | 8,239 | 23,485 | 31,724 | 7,810 | 25,961 | 33,771 | |
| Amount of impounding fees collected (Rs. '000) | 664.73 | 2412.20 | 3076.93 | 1436.94 | 3512.47 | 4949.41 | |
| Volume of suppression involved (Rs Lakhs) | 298.40 | 489.74 | 788.14 | 282.25 | 586.11 | 868.36 | |

Source: Government of Tamil Nadu, Commercial Taxes Department, Madras.

in hides and skins, the number of cases was the maximum but the revenue effect was not large.

As regards the modus operandi of evasion of tax, the data available from the Madras Division for the year 1980-81 show that the method of bill-trading was adopted in the case of the following commodities:

(Rs lakh)

| Commodity | Number of cases | Turnover involved | Revenue effect |
|-------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Electricals and steel | 10 | 41.05 | 1.54 |
| Stainless steel and chemicals | 6 | 9.56 | 0.55 |
| Oil and oil products | 53 | 222.98 | 16.19 |
| Pulses and grams | 9 | 135.35 | 5.43 |

From the above data it can be seen that the highest revenue loss that could have occurred in the absence of the Enforcement Wing was in respect of oil and oil products.

The data available for the Coimbatore District alone for the year 1980-81 reveal the following in respect of different methods of evasion:

(Rs lakh)

| Particulars | Number of cases | Volume of suppression | Tax involved |
|--|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Bill-trading | 2 | 22.26 | 0.89 |
| Exchange of bills (directly) | 12 | 17.31 | 0.69 |
| Exchange of bills through intermediaries | 3 | 33.01 | 1.32 |
| Bogus bills | 17 | 94.94 | 3.80 |
| Counterfeiting of bills | 3 | 12.31 | 0.49 |
| Manipulation of bills | 16 | 43.15 | 9.00 |
| TOTAL | 53 | 222.98 | 16.19 |

The Enforcement Wing has made a special effort to quash tax evasion through bill-trading. Some of the results of such efforts of the Madras Division during the year 1979-80 are given below:

- (i) In Salem, bill-trading in groundnut trade was investigated and 29 cases were booked involving a revenue of Rs 0.62 lakh. This, when pursued, resulted in cancellation of hundreds of bogus Registration Certificates.
- (ii) In Dharmapuri, bill-trading and consequential camouflaging in groundnut trade was unearthed and exemption claim to the tune of Rs 17,850 was disallowed.
- (iii) In sago trade, bogus purchase vouchers to avoid taxation were unearthed in inspections at 250 places in a mass raid, resulting in an increase of revenue to the extent of 20 lakh.
- (iv) In Madras, similar type of evasion under electrical goods involving a revenue of Rs 48,023 and under stainless steel goods involving Rs 1,04,362 have been detected by the Bill Trading Squad. 1/

In regard to consignment sale and stock transfers, a detailed scrutiny has been done by the Enforcement Wing. Some such cases, as investigated by the Inter-State Investigation Cell, that could be mentioned are as follows:

- (i) In one of the cases, the total stock transfer of metal powder to Calcutta Branch alone amounted to Rs 1.11 crore. A minimum of 50 per cent of the transaction could have been brought to assessment under the Central Sales Tax Act to have a revenue effect of Rs 5 lakh.

1/ Points for Discussion, prepared for the meeting of the Deputy Commissioners with the Minister for Revenue and Commercial Taxes, dated August 12, 1980.

- (ii) The other cases relating to Branch transfers to Delhi Depot, came to Rs 3.15 crore, involving a revenue of Rs 9.75 lakh.

Similar cases, in regard to cement with the revenue implication of Rs 74.29 lakh and french polish with the revenue effect of Rs 8.92 lakh were unearthed.

Evasion under the guise of work order has been detected by the Enforcement Wing in a variety of cases. The method of evasion of this type is as follows: Scrap and raw materials are periodically sent to places outside the State without proper documents and finished goods are received from the other States. This is done under the plea that the raw materials are sent for conversion. The investigation of the Enforcement Wing established that the finished goods received had no direct correspondence with the raw materials sent out and the cases were brought under assessment, yielding an amount of Rs 18.83 lakh in the year 1979-80.

Reforms to Check Tax Evasion

Notwithstanding the efforts made by the erstwhile Inspection Wing as well as the existing Enforcement Wing, it is a well-known fact that evasion of the sales tax continues unabated. As seen above, various methods are employed for this purpose. Some of the methods practised by the traders are known to the departmental officials and are practised with the connivance of the concerned officers. But, this is a separate issue. Our concern here is to look into the evil of evasion of tax which needs to be detected and checked.

Among various methods referred to in section 2 of this chapter, some are adopted by the dealers possibly because of structural lacunae. There are others which arise from the administrative procedures adopted by the Department. It is of paramount importance to understand that the structure of the tax, the administrative organisation, and the operational procedures should be so interwoven that the traders find it difficult or not worthwhile to evade tax. In case they do, the law should not permit them to go scot free. We present below the reforms that should be effected in the structure, administrative organisation and operational procedures for minimising evasion of the sales tax.

Registration of Dealers

The registration of dealers being the basic prerequisite for the effective administration of the tax, it is necessary first to review the system of registration. In this connection, it is of importance to see that only genuine dealers are able to get Registration Certificates. Considering the different methods of evasion, one could easily see that many of these become possible because the Department permits all small dealers who ask for registration to get registered. A dealer having a fairly large amount of turnover, goodwill, and stability will certainly not wish to work as a bill-trader. So, we may be able to out down significantly the magnitude of bill-trading by keeping the exemption level fairly high and by refusing to register the small dealers except that voluntary registration may be abolished in the case of small manufacturers. The importance of raising the exemption limit both for proper administration and for checking evasion cannot be emphasised strongly enough.

Normally, the registration procedure involves submission of an application by the dealers to the Assessing Authority for obtaining the Registration Certificate. The Assessing Authority, in turn, gets the bonafides of the dealers verified. In Tamil Nadu, this has not been properly done and this lapse has allowed fictitious dealers to crop up. As a precautionary measure, therefore, it is recommended that, as in West Bengal, a Special Circle be created in the Enforcement Wing. In addition to the usual check by the Assessing Authority, this Circle should also check the bonafides of the applicant dealer. The Registration Certificate should be issued to the dealer only when both the agencies, namely, the Assessing Authority and the Special Circle of the Enforcement Wing, recommend it.

Another measure would be to ask the applicant to produce a Security Bond as well as two good references. The bond could be of an amount of Rs 10,000 to begin with, in the case of an individual proprietor, Rs 50,000 in the case of a partnership firm or a company. After the dealer establishes bonafides to the satisfaction of the Department, the condition of the bond may be released.

Cross-Verification of Transactions

As pointed out in Section 2 of this Chapter, evasion of tax takes place in respect of recorded transactions and unrecorded transactions. Both these methods are possible because a dealer is aware of the fact that once the goods cross the barriers of checkposts, cross-verification of transactions is conspicuous by its

absence. It is, therefore, essential that the Department undertakes this important task which has hitherto been unattended to. As we are going to point out in the next Chapter, the Department should insist upon getting a quarterly statement of sales and purchases of each dealer having turnover above Rs 5 lakh. This could, however, be done for a few select commodities giving large amount of yield. The statements of sales and purchases submitted by these dealers should be put into the computer for cross-verification. Any discrepancy in these transactions, or any obvious doubts in the genuineness of these transactions, could be immediately referred to the Enforcement Wing for prompt check-up.

As pointed out in the Kaiwar Committee Report (Government of Tamil Nadu, 1978), bill-traders are not traceable when the accounts of the first dealer claiming exemption on the basis of the bills issued by the bill trader, are examined. This happens only because cross-verification is not attempted. It is, therefore, strongly recommended that the information flowing from the checkpoints should also be put to the computer for cross-verification and a summary of purchases and sales prepared by the Computer Centre should be sent both to the Assessing Authority of the Commercial Tax District in which the purchaser falls and to the region in which the purchasing as well as the selling dealer have their establishments. An interaction between Assessing Authority and the work done by the Enforcement Wing would enable the Department to check evasion of tax through both non-reporting and under-reporting.

Strengthening of the Enforcement Wing

The existing organisation of the Enforcement Wing has normally gone in for the compounding fee. There is no attempt either to bring the offenders to the court under the existing rules or to prosecute them. The dealers are not bothered about the existing provisions of penalty or prosecution. This is mainly for two reasons. First, once prosecution is launched and the case is taken up for hearing, the accused invariably contests the prosecution. This is followed by several adjournments on some pretext or the other. The prosecution officer and the witness have to spare a lot of time in attending to the court proceedings. This implies stagnation of the progress of other work of the Assessing Authority. The Assessing Authorities, therefore, have become averse to attempting prosecution and turn to the easy way of compounding the offences. Secondly, the Departmental Officers do not possess sufficient knowledge either of law or of administrative procedures to prepare the proper charge-sheet for a successful prosecution. The case normally goes in favour of the accused. We note that the cases fail for want of proper presentation of facts, evidence and of proper arguments; or they end in meagre punishments. Generally, even the cases which are supported by material evidence and facts, have failed in the absence of proper legal guidance to the Department. Thus, the Department has been able to get little for its efforts in this regard. It is, therefore, strongly recommended that the Enforcement Wing should have a Legal Cell attached to both the Divisions, viz., Madras Division and Madurai Division. Whenever prosecution cases are taken up by the Enforcement Wing, the cases

should be handed over to the Legal Cell for filing charge-sheets and conducting trials.

In fact, it is a very dangerous trend to compound all the offences. It gives benefit to the evaders of tax and affects the morale of the honest dealer who ultimately loses as compared to the dishonest person. Instructions should, therefore, be issued to the officers of the Enforcement Wing that grave offences, especially offences that are suggested to be cognizable ones, should not be compounded. Deliberate and strong action on the part of the Department to punish the offenders will certainly do good to the administration of the tax.

Establishment of Police Wing

An organisational problem concerning prosecutions relates to police assistance required by the Wing. This is important in cases of search and seizure as well as the working of the roving squads. As the existing Enforcement Wing does not have any assistance from the police within the Department, they have to depend upon the Police Department. Normally, these persons do not take the tax matters in the same spirit as the persons from the Enforcement Wing do. Also, the police personnel are not properly trained to take up tax cases. It is, therefore, recommended that the Enforcement Wing should be reorganised to have a Police Cell to assist their work. This Cell should be headed by a man of the rank of a DIG. But the work of the Wing should be under the control of the Commissioner of Commercial Taxes. All the persons of the Police Department working under the DIG should be

especially trained to take up tax matters before they are sent to the Enforcement Wing. They should, however, continue to be in the Police Department for the purpose of their service. In this regard the experience of the West Bengal Government is encouraging. There the Bureau of Investigation has been provided with a Police Wing headed by a DIG/WB. The police personnel help the Bureau Officials as and when required and conduct the prosecution cases under IPC/CrPC, as referred to by the Bureau of Investigation. Also, similar help is available to the Enforcement Wing in Punjab, where the Excise and Taxation Department has its own police force.

Strengthening the Border Checkposts

Although checkposts play an important role, the manner of their working in the State leaves much to be desired. First, operational facilities such as weigh-bridges, godowns, loadmen, telephone, and even requisite furniture, are conspicuous by their absence at most of the checkposts (Table 7.17). Secondly, no facilities are available either for the officers working at the checkposts or for their families. And thirdly, the checkposts are not even housed properly; about 62 per cent of the checkposts have thatched sheds.^{1/} Proper facilities for the officials at the checkposts are crucial to the efficient working of the checkposts.

^{1/} The necessity for such amenities had earlier been underlined by the Kaiwar Committee, but so far no action has been taken by the Government. (See, Government of Tamil Nadu, 1979).

TABLE 7.17

Physical Arrangements at the Checkposts in Tamil Nadu
(As on 30.11.1951)

| Particulars | Major check- posts | Minor check- posts | Total |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------|
| 1. Number of checkposts having | | | |
| (i) pucca building | 9 | 7 | 16 |
| (ii) thatched sheds | 6 | 40 | 46 |
| (iii) rental buildings | 5 | 14 | 19 |
| (iv) government buildings | - | 1 | 1 |
| (v) requisite furniture | 4 | 24 | 28 |
| (vi) telephone facility | 2 | 13 | 15 |
| (vii) provision of weigh- bridges | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 2. Total checkposts | 19 | 56 | 75 |

Source : Department of Commercial
Taxes, Tamil Nadu, Madras.

With the existing meagre facilities and the lack of needed manpower, the checkpoints cannot perform their jobs efficaciously. During our visits to the various checkpoints in the State, we found that the vehicles are checked only cursorily; also, hardly five per cent of the vehicles are examined. The vehicles are parked away from the checkpoints and the documents are submitted. In general, these documents are accepted without any verification. Of course, it would be a herculean task to check all the vehicles; however, the present manner of checking is so cursory that it does not serve much purpose.

In practice, we have found that the system does not work as effectively and smoothly as it is intended to. For one thing the documents received from the checkpoints being very large in number, it is found impossible by the Enforcement Wing to get even the majority of the transactions cross-checked. Secondly, the documents are not despatched promptly by the checkpoints. At some of the checkpoints visited by the Study Team, it was found that a substantial volume of documents was awaiting despatch for a long time for want of postage stamps! Such delays tend to defeat the very purpose of collection of information through the checkpoints. (Incidentally, it does not seem proper to burden the Enforcement Wing with the task of cross-verification of the checkpoint documents as they have other more important work to do). Finally, it is our understanding that at the time of assessment the documents received from the checkpoints are not used effectively for cross-checking the returns because they are too voluminous. With a view to eliminating the above deficiencies, we recommend that the checkpoints be properly

staffed. Each checkpost should be in the charge of an officer of not less than the rank of a Commercial Tax Officer. Important checkposts should be manned by senior officers of the rank of Assistant Commissioner supported by Commercial Tax Officers and Assistant Commercial Tax Officers. In addition, each checkpost should have sufficient supporting staff of loadmen, policemen, etc. Other facilities such as residential quarters, godowns, weigh-bridges and public call-office are crucial to the proper maintenance of the checkposts. Finally, as stated in the next Chapter, proper arrangements of the personnel should be done to enable the checkposts officials to send IP-4 Form to the Computer Centre without any delay.

Abolition of Internal Checkposts

One can agree to some extent that if there is a preponderant reliance on the first-point sales tax, checkposts at the borders of the State are useful and even necessary in order to monitor the flow of goods. The main ground on which the first-point tax is advocated is that only manufacturers and importers have to be kept under surveillance and that interference with trade in general would be avoided and any possible harassment will be confined to manufacturers and importers who normally tend to be large dealers. Internal checkposts, however, cannot be said to serve the purpose of monitoring the flow of goods into a State; they interfere with the flow of trade and traffic within a State and cause harassment to a large body of dealers, the majority of whom are generally not liable to pay tax under the system of first-point levy. We have already indicated earlier that the documents collected at the checkposts

cannot be effectively utilised partly because their numbers are too large to be handled. It is obvious that the internal checkpoints themselves contribute a large proportion of the documents. It cannot, therefore, be argued that the existence of the internal checkpoints are really contributing significantly to the checking of evasion. On the other hand, the larger the number of checkpoints, the more is the waste arising from the stoppage of traffic. It has been estimated that the money value of the loss of time suffered by the transporters due to the border checkpoints is Rs 4.11 crore and that due to internal checkpoints Rs 11.14 crore (Annexure II). It need hardly be pointed out that the existence of a large number of checkpoints, particularly within the State is a source of irritation to, and harassment of, the business community. Cases of harassment brought to our notice by the business community are so appalling that even if a small percentage of them were true, that would be sufficient to tarnish the image of the Department in the eyes of the public. The incidents of harassment narrated to us are more or less of the pattern as that described in the Report of Mr. S.P. Srinivasan, (Government of Tamil Nadu, 1974). It is also agreed that checkpoints are a source of corruption and it is, therefore, a sound policy to keep their number down to the barest minimum necessary.

On a careful consideration of all the aspects involved, we strongly recommend that all the internal checkpoints, excepting a few that are near Madras, should be dismantled immediately. This would save more than 70 per cent of the wastage of truck-time, eliminate a

major part of harassment to the business community, but would not seriously affect the monitoring of the flow of goods into the State. Simultaneously, the Department should constitute a large number of Roving Squads equipped with wireless communication system. Also, the Department should establish 'watch units' along the major routes. These units would be equipped with wireless apparatus to keep track of vehicles moving along major routes and to pass on advance information to Roving Squads as well as 'watch units' ahead. The establishment of these two types of units would more than substitute for the present internal checkpoints.

Structural Change

We have so far dealt with administrative and organisational improvements needed to check the evasion of tax. But there is also need for a change in the structure of the tax. Such a change is urgently and specially called for in respect of some commodities. In the case of these commodities not only bill-trading but also large-scale evasion by small manufacturers is rampant. Goods examples are groundnut oil and stainless steel articles. The shift to the first-point levy has facilitated evasion of this kind.

In an attempt to counter evasion in respect of groundnut oil, Government have recently placed it under the multi-point levy (at 2 per cent). This represents an ad hoc response. A multi-point levy with no set-off for tax paid earlier is economically very harmful and cannot be adopted for most or many commodities. The

principle of the value-added tax has to be incorporated into the multi-point tax. As recommended in Chapter 4, the system of value-added tax should be adopted for commodities that suffer large evasion of tax or have large value-added after the first-point tax is levied. This would greatly help check evasion of the tax as well as increase revenue through capture of more value-added. Thus, for example, there should be imposed on groundnut oil a tax of 4 per cent at every stage with set-off for tax paid at the previous stage.

Summing Up

We may briefly recapitulate the steps to be taken to make a substantial dent on the problem of evasion:

- a) Raising the exemption level for registration to at least Rs 75,000 in order to curb bill trading and to enable the Department to concentrate on the larger dealers;
- b) Requiring a security bond and two references from each applicant for registration to curb bill-trading in particular;
- c) Computerisation of sales and purchase data of large dealers in respect of selected commodities, for cross-verifications;
- d) Computerisation of checkpoints data on a comprehensive or at least on a selective basis, for cross-verification;

- e) Strengthening of the Enforcement Wing through the addition of a legal cell;
- f) Adding a Police cell to the Enforcement Wing;
- g) Strengthening of border checkpoints and abolition of internal checkpoints; and
- h) Introducing the multi-point tax with provision for set-off of tax paid at the previous stage.

Annexure 7.1

Commodity Flows and Evasion of Sales Tax in
Tamil Nadu - Case Studies of Automobile
Spare Parts, Groundnut Kernel and Oil

INTRODUCTION

One of the terms of reference of the study is to analyse the tax structure with special reference to trade pattern and evasion of tax. This could be done at macro as well as at micro level. The present exercise attempts to quantify the extent of tax evasion at the latter level.

Two commodities were chosen for the study. This was done on the basis of revenue significance and vulnerability to tax evasion. The commodities selected are automobile parts and groundnuts (kernel as well as oil). The former represents the manufacturing sector and the latter the agricultural sector. Besides, these commodities present a contrast which captures a variety of trade practices and tax evasion in the State.

We present the results of market surveys conducted by us to estimate the potential revenue and compare it with the actual sales tax collections. The surveys throw light on the production, distribution, flow of goods and consumption pattern of the commodities in question. These may be regarded as model surveys for the Department and similar ones could be undertaken by it for other commodities from time to time as needed.

AUTOMOBILE SPARE PARTS AND COMPONENTS

Introduction

The automobiles group brings in a big chunk of sales tax revenue in Tamil Nadu. Its yield ranges between 10.7 and 12 per cent of total sales tax revenue (Table A.7.1). From among the different components of this group, auto-parts occupy an important place. Revenue from them is roughly one-third of the total revenue derived from the tax on automobiles.

Aggregate Demand for Auto-Parts in Tamil Nadu

The relatively high revenue from auto-parts could be explained by demand for them both for local consumption and for manufacturing activity within the State. The former is generated by replacement and the latter by the consumption of auto-parts as inputs to the automobile industry. Since part of the demand is generated by the number of registered vehicles in the State, the growth trend of vehicles over a period of time is relevant for such a study. Also, it is important to observe the growth of number of vehicles by type because the replacement demand varies from one type to another. Further, their use for commercial as well as non-commercial purposes determines the frequency of replacement. Likewise, the age of vehicles, the conditions of roads and the area of operation also affect the demand.

In Tamil Nadu, the number of registered vehicles has increased from 1,64,572 in 1976 to 3,35,272 in 1981 - an annual rate of growth of 13 per cent per annum (Table A.7.2). This growth is much higher than the

average national rate (9 per cent) during the same period (Table A.7.3).

As regards manufacturing activity, Tamil Nadu is one of the leading manufacturers of motor vehicles in the country (Table A.7.4). It manufactures commercial vehicles, passenger cars, and motor cycles. It is likely to enter the field of production of two-wheeler and three-wheeler scooters, and mopeds. This would further increase the demand for auto-parts.

Production of Auto-Parts in Tamil Nadu

As in the case of motor vehicles, Tamil Nadu enjoys the proud status of being a major producer as well as distributor of auto-parts in India. Other major producing States are Maharashtra, Karnataka, and the Union Territory of Delhi (Table A.7.5). "Bombay alongwith its suburbs and the neighbouring towns such as Pune, Nasik, and Kolhapur, dominates the production of auto-spares, with a share of about 34 per cent of capacity. Next comes the Madras-Coimbatore complex with a share of 30 per cent of capacity" (NIPFP, 1981). It manufactures a variety of auto-parts but the capacity utilisation of the units is quite low (Table A.7.6).

The auto-parts are produced by (i) the manufacturers of motor vehicles; (ii) the original equipment contractors; and (iii) the other manufacturers. They are in the large-scale or in the small-scale sector.

A unique feature of the auto-ancillary sector is the multiplicity of items produced. The list of auto-parts covers about 4000 items. Besides, a particular part of some specification can only be used by a particular brand of vehicle and cannot go into other brands. The auto-parts are categorised as follows: (i) Engine parts; (ii) Electrical parts; (iii) Drive transmission and steering parts; (iv) Suspension and braking parts; (v) Equipments; and (vi) Other parts.

An analysis of the trend of production, categorised as per above classification, shows that the three important categories of auto-parts are engine parts (44 per cent of the total), transmission and steering parts (23 per cent), and suspension and braking (19 per cent)(Table A.7.7-8).

The production pattern of auto-parts has its bearing on the marketing system. The large producers have their well defined and identifiable trade channels, which are uniform throughout the country. They have their zonal distribution depots from where the product flows to the other wholesalers or registered dealers in the remote parts of the zone. On the contrary, the distribution system of the small producers is relatively unorganised and the channels are untraceable. It is in this sector that the tax evasion potentiality is very high and the business is often of clandestine nature. For their business they mainly depend upon the retailers, both registered and unregistered.

Among the four important Centres of auto-parts, Madras is one of the important trading and manufacturing centres. Here the manufacturers have their depots as well

as registered offices. In the assessment year 1980-81 there were 1050 registered dealers in the State out of which 958 were assesseees. The main concentration (roughly half of the total) of these dealers is in Madras and the rest are fairly distributed in the State (Table A.7.9) There are 111 manufacturers of auto-parts registered with the Department, of which 90 per cent are in Madras and the rest are distributed between Madurai and Coimbatore. There are 5 manufacturers of motor vehicles, 4 of them in Madras and one in Madurai. The importers of auto-parts are 111 in number, 83.5 per cent of whom are in Madras and the rest of them in Madurai, Trichy and Salem. However, the major part of tax revenue from auto-parts comes from the Madras Centre only. Revenue from this Centre has increased from Rs 330.89 lakh in 1976-77 to Rs 426.67 lakh in 1979-80, showing an annual rate of growth of 10.11 per cent (Table A.7.10). Also, its contribution to the total revenue from auto-parts is in the range of 66 to 77 per cent during the reference period.

Tax Structure of Auto-Parts in Tamil Nadu

In Tamil Nadu, auto-parts are taxed at the first sale in the State. The rate of tax on these parts in general is 13 per cent, provided they are an identifiable constituent of the finished product. The other accessories and parts are taxed at the rate of 15 per cent. Besides, certain specified items such as batteries, electric components, electric items, motor set, starter bolt, and nuts are taxed at 9 per cent; spark plugs and chases are taxed at the rates of 13 and 15 per cent, respectively. However, a concessional rate of 4 per cent is levied when any of the above items are used as inputs by the vehicle manufacturers.

Methodology for Estimation of Tax Evasion

For estimating the extent of tax evasion, we have worked out first the potential of the tax in the State. This could be done through two alternative methods, viz., the production (or supply) method; and the consumption (or demand) method. In this exercise we have adopted the latter method because the data required for the estimation through the former method are just not available.

The potential of the tax depends upon both the direct (or consumption) and indirect (or input) demand for the commodity. The aggregate demand for auto-parts is the sum of the two.

The consumption demand depends upon the number of vehicles in the State, i.e., the larger the number of vehicles, the greater would be the demand for auto-parts. The demand is affected also by the composition of vehicles. It varies according to the nature of ownership (i.e., owned by private persons or by the Government), the nature of use (i.e., commercial and non-commercial), and the type of vehicle. We have, therefore, estimated the consumption demand for each category. This is done by obtaining the production of the number of vehicles in a

category and the per vehicle consumption of auto-parts (Table A.7.11-13).^{1/}

The input demand for auto-parts is dependent on the quantum of motor vehicles manufacturing activity within the State. This has been estimated by applying the proportion of the taxable turnover of auto-parts directly consumed (taxed at the rate of 13 per cent) to the taxable turnover of auto-parts indirectly consumed (taxed at the rate of 4 per cent) (Table A.7.14).

The estimated potential consumption of auto-parts (both direct and indirect) obtained as per the methodology explained above, is inclusive of sales tax paid by the dealer. To obtain the base for estimating potential tax revenue we have estimated potential consumption net of sales tax element. Hence, both the GST and the surcharge have been deducted from the gross value of consumption.

On the basis of the tax potential estimated as per the above methodology, we have estimated the short-fall of actual tax collected in relation to the potential

^{1/} Per vehicle average net consumption of auto-parts (ANC) has been estimated on the basis of the data made available by the State Road Transport Corporations. As 65 per cent of the purchases by these corporations have been within the State, we have taken the net local purchases (after deducting overhead expenses, etc.) to estimate the ANC. This has been applied to the number of vehicles (buses, lorries and trucks owned by the States as well as the private sector). The estimates for other vehicles such as cars, motor cycles, mopeds, and three and four-wheelers, were based on the information collected from knowledgeable persons while conducting the survey.

tax. Such estimates are presented in Table A.7.15. It is seen that during the years 1976-77 through 1979-80 about 40 to 50 per cent of the potential tax revenue under this head is either evaded or avoided.

Evasion is due to various reasons. Some of the reasons have already been explained in the text of this Chapter. One method special to tax evasion in auto-parts is through widespread trade in spurious parts. This is possible because the traders themselves or their agents bring the auto-spares into the State as their personal luggage. As such they are not recorded at any of the checkpoints. Besides, some of the dealers in the other States such as Delhi, Punjab and Haryana, have their travelling agents to supply the auto-parts without getting them recorded. Thus, tax evasion takes place through unrecorded transactions.

GROUNDNUTS AND GROUNDNUT OIL

Groundnut (*Arachis* and *Hypogaea*) was first introduced in India in 16th Century A.D. (Government of Tamil Nadu, 1979). In ancient days this crop was found in Brazil in South America, from where it has spread to other parts of the globe. It is one of the important sources for the extraction of edible oil. Roughly 30 to 40 per cent of the world production of groundnut is contributed by India alone. Here there are three popular varieties of groundnut crop, viz., spread, semi-spread and bunch type. Normally, the spread variety of plants are ready for harvesting after 115 to 120 days of sowing, whereas the bunch type is a short-term crop fit for harvesting after 85 to 90 days of sowing.

Production Structure

In India, Tamil Nadu accounts for 13.1 per cent (Table A.7.16) of the total area under groundnut cultivation and contributes a share of 17.8 per cent of total production of groundnut (Table A.7.17). South Arcot, North Arcot, Salem, Coimbatore and Periyar districts account for 60.6 per cent of total acreage under groundnut cultivation in the State (Table A.7.18). From among these districts, Arcot district alone claims 36.5 per cent of the total area under groundnut crop. The production of groundnut in these districts (excluding Periyar district) constitutes 60.1 per cent of the total groundnut production in the State (Table A.7.19).

The average yield per hectare of groundnuts in Tamil Nadu is 13.95 quintals in irrigated area as against 8.97 quintals under unirrigated area (Government of India, 1975). The percentage of gross area sown under groundnut cultivation has been around 15 per cent (1971-72 to 1973-74) (Government of Tamil Nadu, 1979). Wide fluctuations have been noticed in terms of yield of groundnut among different parts of Tamil Nadu in spite of various protective measures suggested by the Oil Seeds Experiment Station at Tindivanam.

Market Operations and the Structure of Trade

Market operations in groundnuts, as in any other agricultural commodity, involve three types of functions, viz., exchange function (buying and selling operation), physical function (storage and transportation) and financing (credit and pricing) (Richard L.K. Ohls, 1961). However, in our context we deal with only the exchange function which involves the meeting of the growers and traders for sales of produce through commission agents.

In this type of marketing operation, a meeting takes place between the seller and the buyer face-to-face; they negotiate the price or the seller accepts the highest bid price in an auction sale in an assembly of growers and traders. Both the types of market operations are prevalent in Tamil Nadu for the sale of groundnuts.

There is a second type of marketing operation prevalent where the small growers, who cannot afford the transport charge and charges for storing their produce

outside their village, dispose of their produce to village-merchant-cum-commission-agents. Such growers have never been outside their village to observe the market operations for their produce with the result that they accept the low price quoted by itinerant traders. They are virtually seized with the problems of rural indebtedness and accept advance money in order to incur expenses for the agricultural operations before harvest. At the time of the harvest the local sahlukars/intinerant traders who act as commission agents collect the produce from the field of the farmers, at the price favourable to traders.

The third type of marketing of groundnuts is by the grower or village merchant, directly contracting the mill-owners or wholesalers and selling their produce directly to them. The margin of profit in such transaction is high because it is not eroded by the middlemen's profits and market charges. This type is not prevalent very much in the State. Only in certain areas of Pollachi and in Dindigul, big growers of groundnut notify the auction dates directly to mill-owners or wholesalers and arrange for sale of produce in bulk at their premises at a favourable price.

As regards the market structure, selling and buying operations of groundnuts are taking place in regulated markets, commission mandis and co-operative marketing societies. Since the marketing structure varies from district to district, in the lines to follow, we would explain the nature of the operation.

Regulated Markets

One of the best regulated markets for groundnuts is in South Arcot - 90 to 95 per cent of the marketable surplus of groundnuts pass through this regulated market, particularly through the Regulated Market Committee (RMC) in Villupuram. Each regulated market is provided with a transaction shed, drying yard, place for parking carts, lorries and tractors, payment counters for traders, grower sheds for the shelter of growers and public address equipment for announcement of the rates.

These markets follow the practice of the close **bid system**. Growers of groundnut bring their produce to the markets either a day before or in the morning, by lorries or cart loads. The market maistry gives a lot number to each lot and a token is handed over to the respective growers who bring groundnuts for sale. After the assignment of the lot number, the groundnuts are repacked in 80-Kg. gunny bags belonging to the Committee. The licensed literate weighmen record the weight and other particulars in a Chitta in triplicate. The traders assemble in the marketing yard and inspect the lots and record the price per bag of 50 Kgs., in the Chitta. The bid slips are signed by the traders before being deposited in the locked box.

The superintendent of the RMC collects the bid slips from the boxes during noon time and announces the highest price for each lot of groundnut through the public address system. The price is recorded in an auction declaration slip. This is done in the presence of traders. If there is no representation from the grower, RMC authorities assume that the grower accepts

the price for his lot announced in the public address system in the marketing yard and he is expected to collect the payment directly from the concerned traders at the payment counter after surrendering to the superintendent the token issued to him for his lot in the morning. The superintendent makes payment to the grower on the production of the Chitta. Traders get the clearance from the superintendent after showing the original Chitta with stamped acquittance and they clear the groundnut bags from the yard.

In the marketing yard of the RMC, only licenced traders, who pay the market charges such as the market cess, wear-and-tear charges of gunnies and holding charges, are allowed to bid at the auction. No fee is collected from the grower in the above system of market operations. Both growers and traders sell and buy at the prevailing market price in the other markets. The grower gets a fair price inclusive of the incidental expenses on the sale of his produce.

The trend of sales through RMCs shows that less than 15 per cent of production in the State was marketed through it in 1979-80. This means that large quantities of groundnut pass through the unregulated market.

Other Agencies

Groundnut sale is conducted also through co-operative marketing societies. Members of the society bring their produce to the marketing yard for sale. In this framework, co-operative societies act as agents between

dealers or mill-owners and growers. Unlike the RMC, here the growers pay 2 per cent of the sales price towards handling charges by the society. Besides, the co-operative society collects Rs 0.60 per bag of 60 Kgs. from the traders. The close bid system is adopted and the bid is conducted in the morning as soon as the agriculturists bring their produce to the society. The highest bid prices for the different lots are announced in the evening. If the price is accepted the growers later on collect their money from the co-operative society, which in turn collects it from the dealers.

Marketing operations are conducted by the commission agents at marketing centres in Pollachi, Dindigul, Manaparai and Salem. Growers take their produce to the agents. Dealers or traders approach the agents for sale of their produce. Buying and selling take place in front of the office of the commission agents. Traders are given chits and they mark the prices for the lots. Agents collect the marked chits. The highest bid is announced and if this is acceptable to the farmer, commission agents make payments to the grower and later collect from the buyers or dealers. The agent collects 3 per cent commission charge including handling from the farmers.

The sale of groundnut through commission agents is prevalent in unregulated markets in Tamil Nadu. In some parts of Tamil Nadu, like Pollachi and Dindigul, growers directly approach the dealers/mill-owners and dispose of their produce. Mill-owners give crop loan to groundnut growers; in return, they accept groundnut (pods) from the farmers. In this kind of trade practices,

growers do not get a fair price unlike in the RMCs. The small agriculturists sell their produce in villages to the creditor who is a village sahuakar; more often than not, the price received by the grower is lower than the market price. The owners of decorticating units in many places discharge three functions, i.e., the function of the wholesalers, the commission agents and the processors. The major hurdle for the small growers, as we noticed during our field study, is their financial indebtedness to their creditors which does not allow them to bring their produce outside for selling at fair market prices.

Estimation of Evasion of

Sales Tax on Groundnuts

Unlike the preceding study on auto-spares, in respect of this commodity we have followed the production method of estimating the evasion of tax because reliable data are available for this method only.

For estimating tax evasion, first of all we have taken production figures from the Directorate of Agriculture, Government of Tamil Nadu. From the reported production, our attempt has been to estimate the marketable surplus. With a view to doing so, we have accounted for the consumption of farmers (10 per cent), wastage and seed

requirements (21 per cent).^{2/} Thus, we have deducted 31 per cent of the total which would not go to the market; 69 per cent would be the marketable surplus (Table A.7.20). This could comprise the potential tax base for the department. But, as discussed in the earlier paras on trade and market structure, there are different market practices and all the sales are not taxable. Hence, we have tried to obtain from the department the information about stock transfer of groundnuts as well as the export sales - both of which are not taxable. Also, we have taken into consideration the value of imports of groundnut kernel. The net result would thus give us the potential tax base for groundnuts.

^{2/} It is estimated that 16 per cent of total production of groundnuts in the State is retained by the farmers to meet their seed requirements. This estimate is based on the inferences of the Farm Management Study related to Coimbatore district. The study indicates the average seed requirement per hectare of irrigated land accounted for 13.43 per cent of production, whereas the average seed rate per hectare of unirrigated land is 19.35 per cent of the output (See Government of India, 1975).

With a view to arriving at a weighted average of the seed requirements, we have taken the weights of the produce of both the irrigated as well as unirrigated lands. The resultant weighted average shows that the seed requirements would be of the order of 16 per cent of the total output of groundnut kernel in the State.

Discussions with the farmers at a major groundnut growing area in the State, i.e., South Arcot, reveal that the farmers incur loss due to wastage to the extent of 5 per cent of their production before marketing their product.

An earlier study by Dr. Lokanathan (Lokanathan, P.S., (1963) suggested that the wastage and seeds in Andhra Pradesh accounted for 12½ per cent of the total production but there is no explanation as to how he arrived at the figure. Hence, we have followed the results of the Farm Management Study of Coimbatore district.

The estimates of tax potential for groundnuts and its deviation from the actual collection of sales tax are presented in Table A.7.21. The average potential tax revenue from groundnuts for the years 1975-76 to 1979-80 is around Rs 393.00 lakh, whereas for the same period the actual collection of sales tax on groundnuts by the department comes to Rs 165.00 lakh (Table A.7.22). This shows that on an average only 42.13 per cent of the potential revenue has been tapped.

GROUNDNUT OIL

Groundnut oil being the product of the groundnut kernel, the evasion of tax on both these commodities go hand in hand. It is, therefore, useful to estimate the extent of evasion of tax on groundnut oil to at least cross-check the estimates of evasion of tax on groundnut kernel presented in the last section.

Production Structure and Marketing of Groundnut oil

The production structure of groundnut oil can be broadly classified into three kinds of operations, viz., (a) chekku or ghani, (b) rotary, and (c) expeller. Chekku or ghani gives 38 or 39 per cent of weight of kernel crushed as oil but in the other units, i.e., rotary and expeller units, 40 to 45 per cent of the weight of kernel comes out as oil. The residue constitutes the oil cake or punnac with some percentage of oil content due to incomplete oil extraction.

In the year 1979-80, the quantity of groundnut kernel crushed by expeller units in Tamil Nadu accounted for 55 per cent of total production of kernel. The remaining 45 per cent of production was shared by rotaries (40 per cent) and chekku (5 per cent).

The major groundnut oil producing and marketing centres are: Erode, Villupuram, Salem, Madras, Alangudi, Sangampunory and Virudhunagar. There is no restriction on the internal movement of groundnut oil as well as on

despatch outside the State. Nevertheless, the exports of groundnut oil to other States have been insignificant; consignment transfers of groundnut oil are, however, of some importance.

The data made available by the office of the Commissioner of Commercial Taxes show that all the buyers in Villupuram TRMC were oil mill owners. They were the residents of Villupuram taluk. However, the buyers of groundnuts in Nagarcoil RMC (Tirunelveli district) are the registered dealers. The dealers after buying groundnut from farmers sell them on second sale to various oil mill owners. In the latter case, where the dealers buy from the farmers, they first pay purchase tax of 3 per cent on groundnuts but then no tax is paid on the second sale. However, in the former case oil mill owners are required to first pay the purchase tax of 3 per cent on groundnuts and then are subject to 4 per cent tax on the first sale of groundnut oil.

Estimate of Evasion of Sales Tax on
Groundnut Oil

We have attempted to quantify the approximate production of oil for the period 1966-67 to 1979-80. This has been done on the basis of "Production-Method". We already have marketable surplus of groundnut kernel determined on the basis of "Production-Method" explained in the earlier section. To this, we have applied the oil recovery ratio of 39 per cent. The estimated oil production for the years 1976-77 to 1979-80 is shown in Table A.7.23.

The estimated production of groundnut oil works out to 1.56 lakh tonnes in 1976-77 and 2.28 lakh tonnes in 1977-78. In the following years due to good harvests of groundnuts, there was an increase in the production of groundnut oil. Thus sales tax on groundnut oil at 4 per cent is payable to the government by the first seller. The increase in the production of groundnuts, and consequently in that of groundnut oil would have automatically increased the tax revenue of the State if all transactions and activities have been properly recorded. But this is not seen from the data, In fact, there was no increase in tax revenue in those years.

It is estimated that only 36.40 per cent of groundnut oil could be brought under the tax net in 1976-77 (Table A.7.24). In 1979-80, the tax coverage increased to 38.38 per cent of production. Estimates for the years 1976-77 through 1979-80 reveal that above 60 per cent of the marketable surplus of the oil escaped taxation. The estimation is on the high side and the evasion may be around 60 per cent of the potential tax revenue (Table A.7.24) in those years.

To find out the value of the quantity so obtained, we have taken the average of the monthly wholesale prices of groundnut oil as reported by the Madras oil marketing centre. The purchase price of oil is arrived at after deducting from the wholesale price, the wholesaler's margin of profit, the sales tax and the average transport cost to avoid double counting. This value of oil production plus net imports form the basis of the tax base for computing potential tax revenue for the commodity (Table A.7.23). The annual average potential tax revenue for

the years 1976-77 to 1979-80 was Rs 4.92 crore, whereas the average actual tax collected per year during the period was only Rs 1.54 crore (Table A.7.22). This shows that only 32.54 per cent of potential tax has been tapped (Table A.7.24). The average annual evasion of tax as a percentage of difference (between potential tax revenue and actual tax revenue) to actual tax collected is 218.27 per cent (Table A.7.24).

Methods of Tax Evasion

Evasion of sales tax on groundnuts and on groundnut oil takes place through a variety of ways explained in the main text of the Chapter. The modus operandi with special reference to groundnuts is as follows: The first purchaser in most of the cases happens to be an oil miller who is subject to tax both on the first purchase of groundnuts and the first sale of groundnut oil. This person often suppresses both the purchases made by him and the oil crushed from the groundnuts. The purchases are not shown in the books of accounts. Then the crushing is done during the night and the oil and the cake are despatched before dawn to escape detection. If on inspection it is enquired why the stocks of groundnuts are not entered in the books, the answer is given that they belong to such and such farmers who have brought them for crushing on own account. Another way of evading tax is to show in the books that only "coolie-crushing" has been done for a fee on behalf of the producers of groundnuts. Then the oil and the oil cake would be shown as having been brought from the same producers or it would be asserted that they have been removed by the owners. Crushing by small-scale units is widely prevalent and there is large-scale evasion by them.

Annexure VII.2Estimate of Loss of Time Due to Checkposts
(1980-81)A. Loss of Time

| | |
|--|----------|
| 1. Number of vehicles passing through | |
| a. border checkposts | 1366384 |
| b. internal checkposts | 3699197 |
| c. total | 5065581 |
| 2. Average time lost at each checkpost (excluding the vehicles detained or undergoing physical verifications) (minutes) | 30 |
| 3. Time lost due to | |
| a. border checkposts (Hrs.) | 683192 |
| b. internal checkposts (Hrs.) | 1849599 |
| c. total (Hrs.) (a+b) | 2532791 |
| 4. Average speed of vehicles (Kms. per hour) (as per 'B' below) | 15.23 |
| 5. Loss of movement due to | |
| a. border checkposts (Kms.) | 10406748 |
| b. internal checkposts (Kms.) | 28174088 |
| c. total (Kms.) (a+b) | 38580836 |
| 6. Average freight charged by vehicles of 10 tonnes (Rs per Km.) (as per 'B' below) | 3.95 |
| 7. Revenue loss to the transporters ^{1/} in Tamil Nadu due to | |
| a. border checkposts (Rs crore) | 4.11 |
| b. internal checkposts (Rs crore) | 11.14 |
| c. total (Rs crore) (a+b) | 15.25 |

B. Estimation of Average Speed and Average Freight

| Route | Distance | Time required (Hrs.) | Freight (per tonne) |
|------------------------|----------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 1. Delhi - Bombay | 1389 | 90 | 530 |
| 2. Delhi - Calcutta | 1475 | 96 | 580 |
| 3. Delhi - Madras | 2278 | 144 | 1010 |
| 4. Delhi - Tirunelveli | 2705 | 178 | 1000 |
| 5. Delhi - Trivendrum | 2891 | 192 | 1110 |
| 6. Delhi - Madurai | 2565 | 170 | 1010 |
| 7. Delhi - Coimbatore | 2494 | 168 | 930 |
| 8. Delhi - Bangalore | 2086 | 136 | 900 |
| TOTAL | 17883 | 1174 | 7070 |

From the above we estimate as follows:

- (i) Average speed (Km. per hr.): 15.23
(ii) Average freight (Rs per (km.)) 0.395

Note : 1/ The loss would be higher with different assumptions of speed and/or average freight. For example, with a normal speed of the vehicle of, say, 40 kms. per hr. the loss would come to Rs. 40.06 crore.

TABLE A.7.1

Revenue Significance of Automobile Spare Parts
in Tamil Nadu

(Rs lakh)

| Particulars | 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1. Tax on auto spare parts | 477.42 | 453.69 | 569.39 | 644.22 |
| i) Tax on auto parts as per cent to tax on motor vehicles | 36.60 | 28.98 | 32.95 | 33.14 |
| ii) Tax on auto parts as per cent to single-point sales tax revenue | 4.05 | 3.48 | 3.79 | 3.55 |
| iii) Tax on auto parts as per cent of total sales tax revenue | 3.32 | 2.84 | 3.14 | 3.10 |
| 2. Tax on motor vehicles | 1304 | 1565.44 | 1728.30 | 1943.73 |
| i) Tax on motor vehicles as per cent of single-point sales tax revenue | 11.06 | 12.01 | 11.50 | 10.70 |
| ii) Tax on motor vehicles as per cent of total sales tax revenue | 9.07 | 9.79 | 9.52 | 9.53 |
| 3. Sales tax revenue from single-point tax | 11797.56 | 13038.28 | 15033.82 | 18168.05 |
| 4. Sales tax revenue from multi-point tax | 2581.03 | 2958.56 | 3123.27 | 2612.34 |
| 5. Total sales tax revenue | 14378.59 | 15996.84 | 18157.09 | 20780.39 |

Source: Government of Tamil Nadu,
Department of Commercial
Taxes, Madras.

TABLE A.7.2

**Population of Automobile Vehicles in Tamil Nadu
(1975-76 to 1980-81)**

| Vehicle | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 | 1980-81 | (Number) | Compound growth rate (per cent per annum) |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|----------|---|
| Buses | <u>10009</u> | <u>10287</u> | <u>10604</u> | <u>11150</u> | <u>12226</u> | <u>13129</u> | | <u>5.62</u> |
| By type: | | | | | | | | |
| Stage carriages | 9225 | 9538 | 9656 | 10199 | 11307 | 12093 | | 5.64 |
| Comibuses and luxury coaches | 82 | 70 | 93 | 81 | 75 | 70 | | (-)-2.04 |
| Tourist omnibuses | 31 | 31 | 25 | 31 | 46 | 51 | | 11.75 |
| PTV | 416 | 423 | 463 | 480 | 501 | 619 | | 7.50 |
| School buses, etc. | 224 | 225 | 367 | 359 | 297 | 296 | | 6.50 |
| By ownership: | | | | | | | | |
| Under state transport corporation | 4400 | 4953 | 5068 | 5601 | 6407 | 7103 | | 9.78 |
| Under private operation | 5609 | 5334 | 5536 | 5549 | 5819 | 6026 | | 1.79 |
| Lightes | <u>21171</u> | <u>21343</u> | <u>21869</u> | <u>22471</u> | <u>23232</u> | <u>24227</u> | | <u>10.47</u> |
| Public | 18302 | 18525 | 19960 | 22479 | 26267 | 30888 | | 11.42 |
| Private | 2869 | 2818 | 2909 | 2992 | 3265 | 3339 | | 3.57 |
| Motor cars | <u>61636</u> | <u>66003</u> | <u>68713</u> | <u>71056</u> | <u>71626</u> | <u>87208</u> | | <u>2.92</u> |
| Ordinary taxis | 6876 | 5823 | 5874 | 6057 | 5778 | 5021 | | (-)-4.57 |
| Tourist taxis | 2193 | 2342 | 2569 | 3182 | 3568 | 4439 | | 15.37 |
| Care | 48975 | 54392 | 56877 | 58242 | 59183 | 73102 | | 6.73 |
| Jeeps | 2617 | 2813 | 2695 | 2888 | 2459 | 3586 | | 3.61 |
| Station wagons | 816 | 454 | 537 | 507 | 452 | 829 | | 0.02 |
| Amalances | 159 | 179 | 161 | 180 | 186 | 231 | | 6.17 |
| Motor cycles | <u>63344</u> | <u>100162</u> | <u>109508</u> | <u>119626</u> | <u>131410</u> | <u>184508</u> | | <u>19.52</u> |
| Triplets | 22 | 63 | 82 | 235 | 136 | 173 | | 47.79 |
| Other goods vehicles | 3351 | 3338 | 3397 | 2859 | 2692 | 4130 | | 0.63 |
| Others | 658 | 521 | 328 | 504 | 698 | 914 | | 8.79 |
| Auto-rickshaws | 4381 | 4693 | 4870 | 6073 | 6789 | 10983 | | 18.44 |
| TOTAL | <u>164572</u> | <u>206410</u> | <u>220371</u> | <u>236976</u> | <u>255109</u> | <u>335277</u> | | <u>12.96</u> |

Source: Government of Tamil Nadu, Department of Transport, Madras.

TABLE A.7.3

Automobile Vehicles Registration in India

| Vehicle | (in 1000) | | | | | | Compound growth rate (per cent per annum) | |
|------------------------|-----------|------|------|------|------|------|---|-------|
| | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | | 1981 |
| cars and jeeps | 715 | 696 | 748 | 782 | 842 | 867 | 894 | 5.19 |
| axis | 84 | 87 | 79 | 77 | 77 | 82 | 87 | 0.25 |
| buses | 111 | 112 | 117 | 119 | 127 | 139 | 150 | 5.99 |
| goods vehicles | 365 | 344 | 367 | 375 | 402 | 429 | 450 | 5.51 |
| other vehicles | 257 | 309 | 346 | 303 | 414 | 420 | 426 | 2.42 |
| and 3 wheeler vehicles | 1095 | 1131 | 1335 | 1550 | 1806 | 1956 | 2115 | 13.48 |
| TOTAL | 2627 | 2679 | 2992 | 3206 | 3668 | 3893 | 4122 | 9.19 |

Source: All India Automobile and Ancillary Industries Association (1981), Facts and Figures, Automotive Industry of India

TABLE A.7.4

Automobile Vehicles Manufacturing Capacity State-Wise

| State | Commercial vehicles | Jeeps | Passenger cars | Motor cycles | Three wheelers | Scoters | Mopeds |
|-----------------|---------------------|--------|----------------|--------------|----------------|---------|--------|
| Andhra Pradesh | - | - | - | - | - | 3.90 | - |
| Bihar | - | - | - | - | - | 3.90 | 8.76 |
| Delhi | 8.85 | - | - | 21.28 | - | - | 8.76 |
| Haryana | - | - | - | 17.02 | - | 3.90 | 8.76 |
| Gujarat | - | - | - | - | 5.13 | 3.90 | - |
| Jammu & Kashmir | - | - | - | - | - | 1.95 | - |
| Karnataka | - | - | 5.05 | 29.79 | - | 7.97 | - |
| Kerala | - | - | - | - | 29.91 | 3.90 | - |
| Madhya Pradesh | - | - | 8.42 | 10.64 | - | - | 2.63 |
| Maharashtra | 48.21 | 100.00 | 30.30 | - | 25.64 | 37.72 | 16.81 |
| Punjab | - | - | - | - | - | 3.90 | 17.51 |
| Rajasthan | - | - | - | - | 5.13 | 3.90 | - |
| Tamil Nadu | 34.00 | - | 5.72 | 21.28 | - | - | 19.26 |
| Uttar Pradesh | - | - | - | - | 34.19 | 20.16 | 8.76 |
| West Bengal | 8.85 | - | 50.51 | - | - | 4.88 | 8.76 |
| TOTAL | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

Note: Figures represent the percentage share of the licensed capacity by each producing State

Source: Same as Table A.7.3.

Total may not tally due to rounding off.

State-Wise Auto-Spare Parts Manufacturing Capacity (1981)

| Component | (Per cent) | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|----------------|-------------|--------|------------|---------------|-------------|
| | Andhra Pradesh | Delhi | Haryana | Gujarat | Karnataka | Madhya Pradesh | Maharashtra | Punjab | Tamil Nadu | Uttar Pradesh | West Bengal |
| Pistons | - | 42.73 | - | 6.90 | 14.84 | - | 5.34 | 5.93 | 22.26 | - | - |
| Piston pins | 2.27 | 50.38 | - | 8.84 | 12.63 | - | - | 5.05 | 20.83 | - | - |
| Piston rings | - | 25.69 | - | 3.85 | 12.85 | - | 41.43 | 4.62 | 11.56 | - | - |
| Gaskets | - | - | 50.63 | 26.58 | - | - | 22.78 | - | - | - | - |
| Inlet and exhaust valves | 1.35 | 49.18 | - | - | 14.09 | 2.11 | 5.07 | - | 28.18 | - | - |
| Cylinder liners | - | 17.07 | - | - | 9.76 | - | - | - | 73.17 | 19.87 | - |
| Crank shaft | - | - | - | - | - | - | 63.58 | - | 16.96 | - | - |
| Carburettors | - | - | 24.42 | - | - | - | 58.14 | - | 17.44 | - | - |
| Fuel pumps (diesel) M/cylinder | - | 36.41 | - | - | 30.81 | - | 18.77 | 11.20 | 2.80 | - | - |
| Fuel pumps nozzle holders | - | 31.46 | - | - | 45.76 | - | 17.06 | - | 5.72 | - | - |
| Fuel pump elements | - | 27.42 | - | - | 45.92 | - | 23.60 | 1.91 | 1.15 | - | - |
| Fuel pump delivery valves | - | 26.73 | - | - | 43.34 | - | 26.73 | 2.17 | 1.04 | - | - |
| Fuel pump (petrol) | - | - | 55.56 | - | - | - | - | - | 44.44 | - | - |
| Fuel pump (diesel) S/cylinder | - | 32.23 | - | - | 39.56 | - | 19.41 | 7.33 | 1.47 | - | - |
| Fuel pump (nozzle) | - | 26.86 | - | - | 46.05 | - | 23.03 | 2.74 | 1.32 | - | - |
| Filters | - | 44.02 | - | - | 8.80 | - | - | - | - | - | 47.13 |
| Filter elements/inserts etc. | - | 47.29 | - | - | 7.09 | - | - | - | - | - | 45.62 |
| Fly wheel ring gears | - | - | - | 31.68 | - | - | 50.00 | - | 50.00 | - | - |
| Radiators | - | - | - | - | - | - | 30.69 | - | 31.62 | - | - |
| Thermostats | - | 50.00 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 50.00 | - | - |
| Inward bearings and bushes | - | - | - | - | - | - | 37.75 | - | 35.30 | - | 15.79 |
| Starters | 11.15 | - | - | - | - | - | 37.95 | - | 46.41 | - | 2.29 |
| Starter motors | 13.37 | - | - | - | - | - | 55.55 | - | - | - | 16.66 |
| Plywheel magnets | - | 27.77 | - | - | - | - | 55.55 | - | - | - | - |
| Clutch assembly | - | 12.77 | 4.84 | - | - | - | 47.33 | - | 35.06 | - | - |
| Clutch plates | - | 9.14 | 9.50 | - | - | - | 52.63 | - | 28.72 | - | - |
| Generators | 12.61 | - | - | - | - | - | 39.27 | - | 43.78 | - | 4.32 |
| Voltage regulators | 7.45 | - | 15.96 | - | - | - | 25.53 | - | 44.68 | - | 6.38 |
| Distributors | - | - | 33.44 | - | - | - | 17.06 | - | 49.50 | - | - |
| Ignition coils | 8.38 | 20.94 | 15.71 | - | - | - | 31.41 | - | 23.56 | - | - |
| Timing gears | - | - | - | - | - | - | 80.33 | - | 19.67 | - | - |
| Rod ends | 2.13 | - | - | 9.99 | - | - | 62.41 | - | 35.46 | - | - |
| Propeller shafts | - | - | - | - | - | - | 83.35 | - | 6.66 | - | - |
| U-joints/kits | 3.75 | 10.42 | - | - | - | - | 37.00 | 10.00 | 20.83 | - | - |
| Rear axle shafts | - | 7.41 | - | - | - | - | 77.04 | 55.56 | - | - | - |
| Brake assembly | - | 28.86 | - | - | - | - | 50.93 | - | 20.20 | - | - |
| Brake linings | 3.60 | 16.22 | - | - | - | - | 30.14 | - | 42.04 | - | - |
| Clutch facings | - | 51.61 | 28.67 | - | - | - | 19.71 | - | - | - | - |
| Oil seals | 6.11 | 24.51 | - | - | - | - | 50.86 | - | 84.51 | - | 35.99 |
| Wheels | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 84.01 | - | - |
| Shock absorbers | - | - | 20.62 | - | - | - | 52.24 | - | 27.14 | - | - |
| A.R brake assembly | - | 25.64 | - | - | - | - | 12.82 | - | 61.54 | - | - |
| Brake hoses | - | 59.69 | - | - | - | - | 40.31 | - | - | - | - |

The percentage share of the licensed producing States

Source : Same as Table A.7.3

Production Particulars of Auto Spare Parts by Selected Companies in Tamil Nadu
(1975 to 1980)

| Name of the unit | Description | In need capacity | Installed capacity | Production particulars for years | | | | Shortfall of production in 1980 with respect to installed capacity (per cent) | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------|-------|-----------|---|-------|
| | | | | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978-1979 | | 1980 |
| Harshad Engineering Works, Coimbatore | Universal engine bearing, washers and various washers | 7 crore (number) | 60 lakh (number) | 41.40 | 44.40 | 44.00 | 47.50 | 38.39 | 36.02 |
| Devi Engineering Works, Palani | Auto brakes for motorcycles and heavy-duty motorcycles | 1,19,000 (sets) | 50,000 (sets) | 57 | 39 | 51 | 47 | 44 | 54.05 |
| Chennai Engineering Works, Chennai | Auto brakes for motorcycles and heavy-duty motorcycles | 80,000 (number) | 30,000 (number) | 49 | 24 | 34 | 72 | 76 | 4.77 |
| Chennai Engineering Works, Chennai | Auto brakes for motorcycles and heavy-duty motorcycles | 50,000 (number) | 50,000 (number) | 17 | 19 | 24 | 26 | 45 | 10.73 |
| Chennai Engineering Works, Chennai | Auto brakes for motorcycles and heavy-duty motorcycles | 80,000 (number) | 80,000 (number) | 37 | 59 | 60 | 65 | 59 | 22.44 |
| Chennai Engineering Works, Chennai | Auto water pumps | 1 lakh (number) | 1 lakh (number) | - | - | - | - | 15 | 85.42 |
| Chennai Engineering Works, Chennai | Auto water pumps | 1 lakh (number) | 1 lakh (number) | - | - | - | - | 2 | 97.55 |
| S.S. Balakrishnan and Sons Ltd., Coimbatore | Timing chains for automobiles | 10 lakh (metres) | 12 lakh (metres) | 5.31 | 6.53 | 7.14 | 8.63 | 10.00 | 16.67 |
| Jayas Engineering Works, Madras | Auto valves and leaves for road vehicles | 1,200 MT | 1,200 MT | 1,897 | 507 | 2,172 | 2,321 | 2,573 | 44.92 |
| Western Chomson (India) Ltd., Madras | Water thermostat for engines jacket cooling system | 12,000 (number) | 18,000 (number) | 84 | 99 | 75 | 129 | 99 | 39.19 |
| Stemmer Instruments Coimbatore Ltd., Coimbatore | i) Dash board ii) Speedometer cables | 6 lakh (number) 3.5 lakh (number) | 6 lakh (number) 3 lakh (number) | 78 | 112 | 97 | 301 | 365 | 13.67 |
| Kemof India Ltd., Coimbatore | 1) Propeller shaft ii) Universal cross joint kits | 40,000 (number) 5 lakh (number) | 25,000 (number) 25,000 (number) | 3 | 10 | 12 | 15 | 20 | 8.32 |
| Super India Bearings and Bushing Ltd., Namipat | Automobile ancillary metallic engine bearings and thrust washers | 30 lakh (number) | 30 lakh (number) | 1.85 | 2.45 | 3.54 | 2.24 | 6.43 | 73.40 |
| Brakes India Ltd., Madras | Foundations brake equipment | 1.19 lakh (sets) | 1.19 lakh (sets) | 47 | 72 | 29 | 63 | 64 | 69 |
| Pratt Private Ltd., Madras | Valve tappet | - | 2 lakh (number) | 478 | 38 | 58 | 65 | 93 | 33.53 |
| Indian Carburettors, Madras | Car jets | 1.1 lakh (number) | 1.1 lakh (number) | 34 | 49 | 4 | 54 | 59 | 60 |
| Wheels India Ltd., Madras | Automobile wheels | 9,42,000 (number) | 12 lakh (number) | 452 | 521 | 556 | 699 | 729 | 747 |

Source: Government of Tamil Nadu, Department of Small Industries Promotion Council of Tamil Nadu, Madras.

TABLE A.7.7

Production of Automobile Components and Parts in India
Year (April - March)

| Component Group | (Rs crore) | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | 1970-71 | 1971-72 | 1972-73 | 1973-74 | 1974-75 | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 | 1980-81 |
| Engine parts | 41.29 (31.00) | 47.94 (36.58) | 53.31 (37.85) | 69.09 (39.61) | 95.25 (42.97) | 110.76 (43.89) | 115.05 (42.49) | 131.65 (44.71) | 159.80 (41.19) | 174.9 (43.5) | 220.35 (43.96) |
| Electrical parts | 10.56 (7.93) | 12.47 (9.51) | 14.07 (5.99) | 16.60 (9.52) | 16.23 (7.32) | 18.64 (7.39) | 22.95 (8.48) | 22.44 (7.62) | 30.66 (7.90) | 31.3 (7.7) | 36.68 (7.32) |
| Transmission and steering parts | 23.75 (17.83) | 27.33 (20.85) | 25.58 (21.00) | 32.36 (18.55) | 41.44 (18.70) | 47.63 (18.87) | 51.73 (19.11) | 57.61 (19.57) | 79.76 (20.56) | 87.9 (21.8) | 113.85 (22.7) |
| Suspension and braking | 27.37 (20.55) | 30.38 (23.18) | 29.95 (21.27) | 36.55 (20.96) | 41.97 (18.33) | 37.92 (15.03) | 43.91 (16.22) | 42.12 (14.3) | 65.01 (16.76) | 73.3 (18.2) | 90.53 (18.06) |
| Equipment | 6.86 (5.15) | 6.58 (5.02) | 7.23 (5.13) | 7.56 (4.33) | 7.21 (3.25) | 7.58 (3.00) | 10.11 (3.73) | 10.39 (3.53) | 12.16 (3.13) | 14.12 (3.51) | 16.03 (3.20) |
| Other parts | 23.38 (17.55) | 6.36 (4.85) | 6.71 (4.76) | 12.26 (7.03) | 19.57 (8.83) | 29.83 (11.82) | 26.99 (9.97) | 30.22 (10.25) | 40.57 (10.46) | 20.50 (5.60) | 23.83 (4.75) |
| TOTAL | 133.20 (100.00) | 131.06 (100.00) | 140.84 (100.00) | 174.41 (100.00) | 221.66 (100.00) | 252.35 (100.00) | 270.74 (100.00) | 294.45 (100.00) | 387.96 (100.00) | 402.13 (100.00) | 501.27 (100.00) |

Note : Figures within parentheses denote the percentages to total

Source: Same as Table A.7.3.

TABLE A.7.6

Item-Wise Production of Automotive Components/ Parts

in India

(1979 to 1981)

| Component | 1979 | | | 1980 | | | 1979-80 | | | 1980-81 | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|
| | No. of units | Quantity in nos. | Value in Rs'000 | No. of units | Quantity in nos. | Value in Rs'000 | No. of units | Quantity in nos. | Value in Rs'000 | No. of units | Quantity in Nos. | Value in Rs'000 |
| Engine Parts | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pistons | 6 | 4,172,885 | 296,464 | 6 | 4,434,921 | 308,606 | 6 | 4,336,679 | 300,086 | 6 | 4,218,452 | 301,634 |
| Piston pins | 6 | 4,933,932 | 51,651 | 6 | 4,651,399 | 51,120 | 6 | 4,927,112 | 52,439 | 6 | 4,828,238 | 56,637 |
| Piston rings | 40 | 511,943 | 91,851 | 5 | 41,478,902 | 121,834 | 5 | 41,181,022 | 102,623 | 5 | 40,121,612 | 131,513 |
| Cylinder liners | 5 | 318,557 | 12,669 | 5 | 363,565 | 15,912 | 5 | 297,899 | 12,044 | 4 | 318,253 | 18,423 |
| Gaskets | 88 | 846,975 | 93,451 | 3 | 79,975,923 | 103,793 | 3 | 87,221,927 | 96,821 | 3 | 86,398,025 | 103,032 |
| Engine valves | 4 | 943,342 | 51,035 | 5 | 1,071,541 | 107,541 | 5 | 4,091,144 | 65,911 | 5 | 9,560,805 | 125,330 |
| Valve guides | 1 | 307,405 | 1,916 | 1 | 331,784 | 2,281 | 1 | 117,732 | 1,932 | 1 | 332,802 | 2,439 |
| Valve tappets | 1 | 92,709 | 509 | 1 | 81,908 | 7,977 | 1 | 399,348 | 2,239 | 1 | 439,717 | 8,445 |
| Valve seat inserts | 1 | 412,352 | 6,024 | 1 | 416,795 | 7,917 | 1 | 503,925 | 40,168 | 7 | 677,896 | 81,878 |
| Carburetors | 1 | 504,446 | 40,427 | 7 | 635,157 | 49,408 | 7 | 64,003 | 3,316 | 7 | 66,523 | 4,200 |
| Fuel pumps (petro.) | 2 | 65,280 | 3,300 | 2 | 84,518 | 3,419 | 2 | 154,344 | 142,927 | 2 | 207,336 | 248,774 |
| Fuel pump (Dai)/M/cyl. | 2 | 160,936 | 145,050 | 4 | 207,181 | 238,187 | 4 | 439,047 | 40,467 | 4 | 704,780 | 66,997 |
| Fuel pump (Dai)/cyl. | 3 | 440,500 | 40,512 | 3 | 686,172 | 63,681 | 3 | 1,160,729 | 82,154 | 3 | 1,323,175 | 99,282 |
| F.P. nozzle holders | 1 | 189,723 | 82,093 | 3 | 1,194,374 | 91,702 | 3 | 4,156,137 | 133,576 | 3 | 4,736,249 | 149,010 |
| Fuel pump nozzles | 4,027 | 999 | 129,179 | 5 | 4,717,515 | 145,541 | 5 | 2,080,361 | 59,673 | 5 | 4,074,957 | 118,523 |
| Fuel pump elements | 1 | 915,670 | 55,277 | 3 | 3,996,441 | 114,682 | 3 | 3,758,395 | 34,384 | 4 | 4,792,269 | 40,871 |
| F.P. delivery valves | 3 | 388,649 | 28,801 | 5 | 4,908,044 | 43,373 | 5 | 171,528 | 3,781 | 4 | 270,615 | 7,308 |
| Glow Plug | 1 | 192,204 | 4,282 | 1 | 255,091 | 6,491 | 1 | 411,925 | 39,544 | 5 | 394,594 | 27,230 |
| Filters | 4 | 407,886 | 27,790 | 5 | 930,884 | 28,847 | 4 | 4,956,059 | 47,032 | 4 | 4,389,114 | 50,483 |
| Filters elements/inserts/cartidges | 4 | 4,997,365 | 50,301 | 4 | 4,253,080 | 45,413 | 4 | 133,753 | 8,385 | 1 | 158,470 | 10,388 |
| Flywheel ring gears | 1 | 133,844 | 8,336 | 1 | 158,903 | 10,770 | 1 | 60,463 | 85,461 | 2 | 64,680 | 107,788 |
| Crankshafts | 2 | 57,993 | 75,591 | 2 | 63,887 | 103,627 | 2 | 176,514 | 156,349 | 2 | 173,981 | 196,961 |
| Radiators | 2 | 178,250 | 14,252 | 7 | 172,282 | 186,200 | 2 | 119,211 | 3,851 | 2 | 162,505 | 6,937 |
| Water thermostats | 2 | 135,817 | 4,500 | 2 | 143,312 | 8,343 | 2 | 119,211 | 3,851 | 2 | 162,505 | 6,937 |
| Thinwall bearings | 3 | 111,220,24 | 27,380 | 4 | 13,710,233 | 183,710 | 3 | 11,058,761 | 137,880 | 4 | 14,808,180 | 167,220 |
| Thickwall bearings | 1 | 239,800 | 11,601 | 1 | 235,490 | 13,532 | 1 | 249,481 | 12,367 | 1 | 243,384 | 14,234 |
| Rotter pumps | 1 | 47,366 | 4,366 | 1 | 47,114 | 5,028 | 1 | 46,211 | 4,400 | 1 | 45,290 | 4,912 |
| Other engine parts | 1 | 47,735 | 5,735 | 1 | 47,114 | 66,144 | 1 | 46,211 | 4,400 | 1 | 45,290 | 73,936 |
| TOTAL | | | 7,263 | | | 2,127,557 | | | 1,749,320 | | | 2,203,468 |
| Electrical Parts | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Starter motors | 5 | 218,042 | 135,255 | 4 | 200,817 | 132,450 | 5 | 209,235 | 127,752 | 4 | 215,566 | 146,171 |
| Generators | 225 | 322 | 78,662 | 5 | 196,231 | 74,956 | 5 | 200,125 | 70,249 | 4 | 213,481 | 82,024 |
| Voltage regulators | 5 | 53,644 | 28,241 | 5 | 467,727 | 30,157 | 5 | 52,616 | 28,305 | 4 | 473,863 | 32,225 |
| Distributors | 2 | 52,781 | 5,612 | 2 | 59,478 | 5,892 | 2 | 48,303 | 4,356 | 2 | 63,418 | 6,467 |
| Distributors caps | 2 | 52,781 | 9,476 | 2 | 24,445 | 7,774 | 2 | 21,251 | 9,061 | 2 | 280,111 | 9,157 |
| Ignition coils | 2 | 274,520 | 9,417 | 2 | 24,559 | 7,920 | 2 | 73,724 | 1,725 | 3 | 35,287 | 8,483 |
| Solenoid switches | 2 | 99,483 | 2,151 | 2 | 36,630 | 40,129 | 2 | 5,627,359 | 24,366 | 2 | 8,554,610 | 43,034 |
| Spark plugs | 2 | 2,002,885 | 25,463 | 2 | 8,172,500 | 4,487 | 1 | 2,205,833 | 10,913 | 1 | 165,175 | 4,847 |
| Conmutators | 1 | 178,134 | 10,413 | 1 | 172,500 | 4,487 | 1 | 130,383 | 23,768 | 2 | 167,520 | 28,565 |
| Flywheel magnetos | 2 | 114,201 | 20,217 | 2 | 157,888 | 26,941 | 2 | 130,383 | 23,768 | 2 | 167,520 | 28,565 |
| Other electrical parts and spares | | | 12,245 | | | 12,605 | | | 12,253 | | | 13,174 |

parts and spares - 12,245 - 12,605 - 12,253 - 13,174
 TOTAL 328,152 336,942 313,179 366,800

Drive Transmission and Steering Parts

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|---------|-----------|-----------|---|-----------|---------|---|-----------|-----------|
| 7 | 276,093 | 52,795 | 270,441 | 58,771 | 7 | 270,830 | 49,907 | 7 | 284,921 | 66,144 |
| 8 | 710,025 | 93,604 | 803,124 | 116,407 | 8 | 741,470 | 99,590 | 8 | 824,303 | 123,650 |
| 4 | | 23,678 | | 22,791 | 4 | | 23,023 | 3 | | 26,745 |
| 3 | 1,266,955 | 22,550 | 1,162,882 | 22,564 | 3 | 1,115,896 | 24,667 | 2 | 1,123,565 | 22,783 |
| 1 | 82,279 | 57,152 | 81,651 | 61,079 | 3 | 83,849 | 56,132 | 3 | 95,022 | 74,614 |
| 1 | 51,572 | 3,876 | 69,734 | 5,597 | 1 | 54,651 | 4,113 | 1 | 75,917 | 6,485 |
| 6 | 5,211 | 215,579 | 5,486 | 291,271 | 6 | 3,792 | 236,130 | 6 | 5,480 | 294,864 |
| 4 | 160,713 | 43,439 | 159,387 | 62,247 | 3 | 112,935 | 44,131 | 4 | 156,585 | 67,369 |
| 4 | 292,410 | 19,364 | 375,154 | 31,250 | 5 | 303,982 | 24,443 | 5 | 416,799 | 32,598 |
| 2 | 221,047 | 28,205 | 300,100 | 48,771 | 4 | NA | 31,013 | 6 | 59,378 | 27,101 |
| 5 | 12,845,113 | 40,952 | NA | 22,044 | 2 | NA | 20,204 | 4 | 396,943 | 59,378 |
| 2 | 968,282 | 251,139 | 1,044,948 | 281,606 | 2 | 1,025,821 | 263,355 | 2 | 1,075,546 | 294,963 |
| | | 870,748 | | 1,024,404 | | | 879,007 | | | 1,136,547 |

Suspension and Braking Parts

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|----|-----------|---------|----|-----------|---------|
| 10 | 29,000 | 175,800 | 32,000 | 237,500 | 10 | 29,800 | 160,500 | 10 | 33,500 | 240,976 |
| 4 | 2,161,447 | 89,501 | 2,227,846 | 103,582 | 4 | 2,172,199 | 90,252 | 4 | 2,294,600 | 107,718 |
| 1 | 54,395 | 96,983 | 63,737 | 122,190 | 1 | 53,862 | 101,324 | 1 | 65,280 | 163,199 |
| 2 | 106,488 | 219,790 | 108,385 | 222,295 | 2 | 104,967 | 213,672 | 2 | 133,466 | 243,305 |
| 2 | 5,757 | 136,515 | 4,730 | 129,843 | 5 | 4,437 | 136,545 | 5 | 4,991 | 133,689 |
| 2 | | 10,922 | | 15,305 | 2 | | 11,315 | 2 | | 15,928 |

Equipment

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------|---------|---------|---------|---|---------|---------|---|---------|---------|
| 4 | 391,144 | 25,720 | 403,514 | 30,052 | 4 | 426,515 | 26,932 | 4 | 412,386 | 30,501 |
| 3 | 312,376 | 6,112 | 269,310 | 6,443 | 3 | 327,362 | 6,436 | 3 | 299,360 | 7,491 |
| 3 | 112,842 | 19,000 | 80,380 | 13,593 | 3 | 102,387 | 16,056 | 3 | 85,542 | 14,401 |
| 1 | 461,561 | 5,332 | 520,757 | 7,037 | 1 | 530,507 | 7,202 | 1 | 527,307 | 8,165 |
| 6 | 201,133 | 8,131 | 200,457 | 9,056 | 6 | 208,159 | 8,345 | 4 | 201,535 | 9,291 |
| 3 | 91,343 | 2,241 | 32,506 | 2,782 | 3 | 67,513 | 2,301 | 2 | 34,839 | 2,790 |
| 3 | 277,018 | 1,949 | 312,852 | 3,013 | 3 | 254,083 | 2,234 | 3 | 327,432 | 3,274 |
| 3 | 563,266 | 26,153 | 546,043 | 26,495 | 3 | 541,929 | 25,339 | 3 | 561,956 | 30,765 |
| 3 | 376,022 | 11,185 | 375,863 | 13,213 | 3 | 352,350 | 11,027 | 3 | 400,460 | 14,180 |
| 3 | 361,306 | 16,385 | 325,948 | 16,619 | 3 | 321,596 | 15,978 | 3 | 348,633 | 17,457 |
| 3 | 366,279 | 5,942 | 227,497 | 4,480 | 3 | 321,483 | 5,333 | 3 | 232,784 | 4,682 |
| 3 | 206,987 | 7,942 | 155,631 | 7,162 | 3 | 206,204 | 7,463 | 3 | 191,501 | 7,583 |
| 3 | | 6,659 | | 6,996 | 3 | | 6,514 | 3 | | 9,601 |
| | | 144,437 | | 149,250 | | | 141,161 | | | 160,276 |

(Others)

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|---|-----------|---------|---|----|-----------|
| Tipping gears and parts | 1 | - | - | 109,780 | 1 | - | 93,773 | 1 | - | 115,116 |
| Hydraulic pumps | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | NA |
| Cylinders and valves | 1 | 4,368,121 | 5,364,601 | 13,614 | 1 | 5,180,000 | 7,111 | 1 | NA | 50,083 |
| Tyre tube valves | 2 | - | - | 49,393 | 3 | - | 31,670 | 4 | - | 2,051 |
| Rubber tube valves | 2 | 6,875 | 2,444 | 2,054 | 2 | 5,786 | 3,414 | 1 | - | - |
| Fare meters | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Sheet metal parts and miscellaneous | - | - | - | 70,834 | - | - | 69,008 | - | - | 71,038 |
| TOTAL | | 191,960 | - | 245,675 | | 204,976 | 238,288 | | | 5,012,288 |
| GRAND TOTAL | | 3,932,071 | 4,714,143 | 4,021,296 | | 5,012,288 | | | | |

Note: Figures as of end March.

Source: Same as Table A.7.3

TABLE A.7.9

Division-Wise Distribution of Auto-Parts Dealers in
Tamil Nadu
(1980-81)

| Division | Regis- tered dealers | Assess- ees | Manufa- cturers of parts | Manufa- cturers of vehi- cles | Impor- ters |
|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| Trichy | 110 (10.48) | 110 (11.48) | - | - | 2 (7.06) |
| Tirunelveli | 93 (8.86) | 71 (7.41) | - | - | - |
| Coimbatore | 72 (6.86) | 72 (7.52) | 5 (4.50) | - | - |
| Pollachi | 2 (0.19) | 2 (0.31) | - | - | - |
| Salem | 78 (7.43) | 61 (6.37) | - | - | - (1.70) |
| Vellore | 100 (9.52) | 75 (7.83) | 1 (0.90) | - | - |
| Udhagai | 17 (1.62) | 11 (1.15) | - | - | - |
| Madras (South) | 243 (23.14) | 233 (24.32) | 89 (80.18) | 2 (40.00) | 144 (35.04) |
| Madras (North) | 212 (20.10) | 212 (22.13) | 11 (9.91) | 2 (40.00) | 199 (48.42) |
| Madurai | 123 (11.71) | 111 (11.59) | 5 (4.50) | 1 (20.00) | 32 (7.79) |
| TOTAL | 1050 (100.00) | 958 (100.00) | 111 (100.00) | 5 (100.00) | 411 (100.00) |

Note: Figures within parentheses denote the percentage of total

Source: Same as Table A.7.1

TABLE A.7.10

Major Revenue Yielding Districts Under TNGST
Rev. from Auto Parts
 (1976-77 to 1979-89)

(Rs lakh)

| Commercial taxes district | 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 | Compound growth rate (per cent) per annum |
|---------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---|
| Madras | 330.89 (69.31) | 317.55 (69.99) | 388.06 (68.15) | 426.67 (66.23) | 10.11 |
| Madurai | 71.71 (15.02) | 67.46 (14.87) | 80.80 (14.19) | 116.16 (18.03) | 17.67 |
| Coimbatore | 34.55 (7.24) | 25.95 (5.72) | 45.42 (7.98) | 42.63 (6.62) | 12.64 |
| Rest of the State | 40.28 (8.44) | 42.73 (9.42) | 55.11 (9.68) | 58.76 (9.12) | 14.88 |
| TOTAL | 477.43 (100.00) | 453.69 (100.00) | 569.39 (100.00) | 644.22 (100.00) | 11.92 |

Note : Figures within parentheses denote the percentage to total

Source: Same as Table A.7.1

TABLE A.7.11

Population of Motor Vehicles in Tamil Nadu

(Number)

| Year | Buses under State trans- port corpo- rations | Pri- vate buses, trucks and lorr- ies | Taxis etc. | Pri- vate motor cars | Motor cycles mopeds etc. | Three and four wheelers and other vehicles | Total |
|---------|--|---|---------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--------|
| 1976-77 | 4953 | 26671 | 11611 | 54392 | 100162 | 8615 | 206410 |
| 1977-78 | 5068 | 28405 | 11836 | 56877 | 109508 | 8677 | 220371 |
| 1978-79 | 5601 | 31020 | 12814 | 58242 | 119628 | 9671 | 236976 |
| 1979-80 | 6407 | 35351 | 12443 | 59183 | 131410 | 10315 | 255109 |

Source : Same as Table A.7.2

TABLE A.7.12

Estimate of Per Vehicle Consumption of
Automobile Parts in Tamil Nadu

(Rupees)

| Year | Buses under State trans- port corpo- rations | Private buses, trucks, and lorries | Taxis, ambu- lance etc. | Private cars | Motor cycles, mopeds etc. | Three and four whee- lers and other vehicles |
|---------|--|--|----------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|--|
| 1976-77 | 9602 | 14773 | 2360 | 944 | 472 | 1180 |
| 1977-78 | 10081 | 15510 | 2478 | 991 | 496 | 1239 |
| 1978-79 | 10670 | 16416 | 2622 | 1049 | 525 | 1311 |
| 1979-80 | 12206 | 18778 | 5000 | 1200 | 600 | 1500 |

TABLE A.7.13

Estimate of Consumption of Automobile Parts in
Tamil Nadu

(Rs lakh)

| Year | Buses under State trans- port corpo- rations | Private buses, trucks and lorries | Taxis | Private motor cars | Motor cycles, mopeds, etc. | Three and four wheelers and other vehicles | Total consum- ption of auto parts |
|---------|--|---|--------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|
| 1976-77 | 465.59 | 3940.99 | 274.02 | 513.46 | 472.76 | 101.66 | 5776.48 |
| 1977-78 | 510.91 | 4405.62 | 293.30 | 563.65 | 543.16 | 100.51 | 6424.15 |
| 1978-79 | 597.63 | 5092.24 | 335.98 | 610.96 | 628.05 | 126.79 | 7391.65 |
| 1979-80 | 782.04 | 6638.21 | 373.29 | 710.20 | 788.46 | 154.43 | 9446.93 |

TABLE A.7.14

Sales Taxation Pattern of Auto-Parts in Tamil Nadu

| | Gross turn- over | Taxable turnover (TTO) | Sales tax collection | Surcharge | Total sales tax (T) | Effective rate of tax (per cent) $\left(\frac{T}{TTO} \cdot 100 \right)$ |
|---|------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|--|
| 1. As final product | 16529.93 (71.42) | 6433.93 (67.41) | 820.38 (86.83) | 40.06 (86.64) | 860.44 (86.82) | 13.37 |
| 2. As input | 6614.89 (28.59) | 3110.32 (32.59) | 124.39 (13.17) | 6.18 (13.37) | 130.57 (13.18) | 4.20 |
| 3. Total tax | 23144.82 (100.00) | 9543.73 (100.00) | 944.77 (100.00) | 46.24 (100.00) | 991.01 (100.00) | 10.38 |
| 4. Line (2) as per cent of line (1) | 40.02 | 48.35 | 15.16 | 15.43 | 15.17 | |

Note : Figures within parentheses denote the percentage to total Source: Same as Table A.7.1.

TABLE A.7.15

Estimate of Sales Tax Evasion/Avoidance on Automobile
Spare Parts in Tamil Nadu

| Year | Tax on local consumption | | Tax on input | | Total estimated potential sales tax T | Actual sales tax collected T [@] | Shortfall of tax collection (T-T) | Shortfall as percentage of potential tax (T-T) |
|---------|---|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| | Estimated potential local consumption (at 13.37 per cent) | Estimated potential consumption as input (at 4.2 per cent) | Estimated potential sales tax | Estimated potential sales tax | | | | |
| 1976-77 | 5778.48 | 681.47 | 2795.90 | 112.61 | 794.43 | 477.43 | 316.65 | 39.88 |
| 1977-78 | 6224.15 | 757.62 | 3106.07 | 125.20 | 882.82 | 453.69 | 429.13 | 48.61 |
| 1978-79 | 7391.65 | 8871.72 | 3573.86 | 144.04 | 1015.77 | 569.39 | 446.38 | 43.94 |
| 1979-80 | 9446.93 | 11114.10 | 4567.59 | 184.11 | 1298.21 | 644.22 | 653.99 | 50.38 |

Source : @ Same as Table A.7.1

TABLE A.7.15

Area Under Groundnut Cultivation in
India
(Major States)

| State | (Hectares) | | | |
|----------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 |
| Andhra Pradesh | 1330500 (18.42) | 1051300 (14.93) | 1099400 (15.64) | 1262800 (16.73) |
| Gujarat | 1640700 (22.72) | 1886700 (26.79) | 1971200 (28.05) | 2038900 (27.01) |
| Tamil Nadu | 934700 (12.94) | 890000 (12.64) | 926000 (13.17) | 990000 (13.12) |
| Other States | 3315600 (45.92) | 3214800 (45.64) | 3031900 (43.14) | 4246400 (43.14) |
| All India | 7221500 | 7042800 | 7028500 | 7548100 |

Note: Figures within parentheses denote the percentage of total

Source: Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, Director of Economics and Statistics, Estimates of Area and Production of Principal Crops in India, 1978-79, New Delhi.

TABLE A.7.17

Production of Groundnut in India

| State | (Tonnes) | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 |
| Andhra Pradesh | 1119400 (16.57) | 5832200 (11.08) | 1023400 (16.81) | 1128500 (17.67) |
| Gujarat | 2034600 (30.12) | 1898400 (36.01) | 1763300 (28.97) | 1826500 (28.60) |
| Tamil Nadu | 1053410 (15.60) | 785623 (14.92) | 1149840 (18.89) | 1128540 (17.67) |
| Rest of the States | 2547290 (37.17) | 1996677 (37.94) | 2150560 (35.33) | 2303460 (26.06) |
| All India | 6754700 | 5263900 | 6087100 | 6387000 |

Note : 1. Production figures are supplied by the Directorate of Agriculture, Government of Tamil Nadu, Madras.

2. Figures within parentheses denote the percentage of total

Source : Government of India, Ministry of Agriculture, Director of Economics and Statistics, Estimates of Area and Principal Crops in India 1970-79, New Delhi.

TABLE A.7.18

Area Under Cultivation of Groundnut in Tamil Nadu

(Hectares)

| Name of the District | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 |
|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Chengalpat | 58,637 | 55,140 | 61,565 | 66,746 | 67,000 |
| South Arcot | 1,42,756 | 1,46,152 | 1,43,155 | 1,53,298 | 1,54,000 |
| North Arcot | 2,29,421 | 2,25,821 | 2,22,287 | 2,10,354 | 2,11,000 |
| Salem | 98,824 | 99,563 | 95,587 | 1,09,906 | 1,10,000 |
| Dharmapuri | 59,232 | 57,494 | 48,236 | 54,457 | 55,000 |
| Coimbatore | 1,08,571 | 94,266 | 1,04,156 | 1,27,039 | 1,31,000 |
| Tiruchirapalli | 56,508 | 53,923 | 60,600 | 62,555 | 63,000 |
| Pudukottai | 43,542 | 44,700 | 48,381 | 49,462 | 50,000 |
| Thanjavur | 41,327 | 29,475 | 40,481 | 46,750 | 47,000 |
| Madurai | 56,316 | 52,423 | 61,078 | 62,546 | 70,000 |
| Ramanathapuram | 27,410 | 22,553 | 24,998 | 23,872 | 25,000 |
| Tirunelveli | 9,678 | 6,694 | 13,623 | 14,507 | 15,000 |
| The Nilgiris | 3 | - | - | 1 | - |
| Kanyakumari | 2,480 | 1,764 | 1,819 | 1,851 | 2,000 |
| TOTAL | 9,34,705 | 8,89,968 | 9,25,966 | 9,83,344 | 10,00,000 |

- Sources : 1. Government of Tamil Nadu, Office of the Director of Agriculture, Madras.
2. For data 1979-80, The Madras Oil and Seeds Association, Madras.

TABLE A.7.19

Production of Groundnut in Tamil Nadu

| Name of the District | (Tonnes) | | | | |
|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 |
| Chengalpat | 95,930 | 67,200 | 86,680 | 87,120 | 35,260 |
| North Arcot | 2,59,030 | 1,85,570 | 2,75,610 | 1,71,310 | 1,18,430 |
| South Arcot | 1,72,570 | 1,62,470 | 2,18,020 | 2,06,900 | 1,14,010 |
| Salem | 94,790 | 68,000 | 1,19,330 | 1,33,410 | 97,520 |
| Dharmapuri | 64,010 | 64,090 | 80,090 | 80,880 | 43,700 |
| Coimbatore | 1,27,050 | 69,130 | 1,49,360 | 1,39,690 | 63,010 |
| Tiruchirapalli | 68,170 | 46,940 | 53,880 | 76,090 | 47,090 |
| Pudukottai | 38,010 | 52,080 | 37,360 | 53,480 | 25,650 |
| Thanjavur | 38,220 | 31,900 | 52,170 | 48,870 | 16,090 |
| Madurai | 56,510 | 52,423 | 52,370 | 87,220 | 65,670 |
| Ramanathapuram | 25,040 | 19,160 | 19,620 | 22,040 | 13,160 |
| Tirunelveli | 11,450 | 6,030 | 17,610 | 18,810 | 14,090 |
| Kanyakumari | 2,630 | 1,200 | 1,940 | 1,820 | NR |

- Sources:
1. Government of Tamil Nadu, Office of the Director of Agriculture, Madras.
 2. Government of Tamil Nadu, Office of the Commissioner of Statistics, Madras.
 3. Government of Tamil Nadu, Directorate of Oil Seeds, Madras (for 1979-80 figures).

TABLE A.7.20

Estimation of Marketable Surplus (Excluding Net imports)
of Groundnut in Tamil Nadu by "Production Method"
 (1975-76 to 1979-80)

| Year | Total produ- ction of ground- nuts(pods) (tonnes) ('000) | Output ground- nut kernels (tonnes) ('000) | Pre- marke- ted consum- ption (non- moneti- sed) (tonnes) ('000) | Seeds for sowing (tonnes) ('000) | Was- tage (to- nnes) ('000) | Marke- table surplus (tonnes) 2-(3+4+ 5) ('000) | Market- able sur- plus ex- cluding net impo- rts (Rs lakh) |
|---------|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| 1975-76 | 1053 | 769 | 77 | 123 | 38 | 531 | 12272 |
| 1976-77 | 786 | 574 | 57 | 92 | 29 | 396 | 10506 |
| 1977-78 | 1150 | 839 | 84 | 134 | 42 | 579 | 17377 |
| 1978-79 | 1129 | 824 | 82 | 132 | 41 | 568 | 13856 |
| 1979-80 | 654 | 477 | 48 | 76 | 24 | 329 | 10764 |

TABLE A.7.21

Actual and Potential Tax Revenue and Index of Tax Effort for
Groundnuts in Tamil Nadu
(1975-76 to 1979-80)

| Year | (1) Actual tax revenue (Rs Lakh) | (2) Marketable surplus including net imports (Rs lakh) | (3) Potential tax base (Rs lakh) | (4) Potential tax re- venue (Rs lakh) | (5) Index of tax realisa- tion (+ 4) | (6) Difference between potential tax. esti- mated and actual tax revenue (Rs lakh) | (7) Difference as percen- tage of potential tax (6 + 4) | (8) Difference as percentage of actual tax turnover (6 + 1) |
|---------|---|--|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1975-76 | 176 | 12412 | 12412 | 372 | 47.85 | 194 | 52.15 | 108.99 |
| 1976-77 | 184 | 10626 | 10626 | 319 | 57.68 | 134 | 42.01 | 72.83 |
| 1977-78 | 134 | 17575 | 17575 | 527 | 25.43 | 393 | 74.57 | 293.28 |
| 1978-79 | 173 | 14014 | 14014 | 420 | 41.19 | 248 | 59.05 | 143.35 |
| 1979-80 | 159 | 10887 | 10887 | 327 | 48.62 | 167 | 51.07 | 105.03 |

(225)

TABLE A.7.22

Sales Tax Collection in Tamil Nadu from the Purchase and Sale of
Groundnut and Groundnut Oil

| | 1972-73 | 1973-74 | 1974-75 | 1975-76 | 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 |
|---|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1. Total sales tax collection (single-point and multi-point) from all the commodities | 6941.58 | 8563.73 | 10687.21 | 11735.79 | 14257.41 | 16840.44 | 17257.09 | 19558.08 |
| 2. Sales tax collected from the first purchase of groundnut in the State | - | - | - | 178.06 | 184.36 | 134.24 | 172.52 | 159.14 |
| 3. Sales tax collected from the first sale of groundnut oil in the State | - | - | - | - | 147.48 | 168.46 | 148.70 | 154.02 |

Source : Government of Tamil Nadu, Office of the
Commissioner of Commercial Taxes, (1981),
Madras.

TABLE A.7.23

Estimation of Production of Groundnut Oil in Tamil Nadu
(1976-77 to 1979-80)

| Year | Marketable surplus of groundnut kernels (tonnes) | Net import of groundnut kernels from other States (tonnes) | Quantity of kernels available for oil crushing (tonnes) | Recovery of groundnut oil or oil production (39 per cent of weight of kernels (tonnes) | Wholesale price (P1) | Oil production (Rs '000) | Net imports of groundnut (Rs '000) |
|---------|--|--|---|--|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1976-77 | 395718 | 3642 | 399360 | 155750 | 6250.30 | 9,73,484 | 39581 |
| 1977-78 | 579175 | 5316 | 584491 | 227951 | 6585.51 | 15,01,174 | 61050 |
| 1978-79 | 568446 | 5157 | 573603 | 223705 | 5776.33 | 12,92,194 | 52456 |
| 1979-80 | 329258 | 2021 | 331279 | 129199 | 7463.60 | 96,42,910 | 39218 |

Note : It is assumed that all the marketable surplus of groundnut kernels plus imports are taken for purpose of oil crushing in the State. Sale of groundnut kernel for bakery purpose is estimated roughly at 0.5 per cent of production which is relatively negligible when we look at the quantity of kernel sent for oil mills. Therefore, purchase of kernel out of the marketable surplus for "Kadali Mittai" is included in the pre-marketed consumption. 0.5 per cent of production is exchanged for paddy in the barter system by the groundnut growers in the villages. Therefore, that part of the quantity of groundnut does not come under the purview of the market operations.

TABLE A.7.24

Actual and Potential Tax Revenue and Index of Tax Effort
for Groundnut Oil in Tamil Nadu
 (1976-77 to 1979-80)

| Year | Actual tax collected (Rs '000) | Marketable surplus net imports (Rs '000) | Potential tax base (Rs '000) | Potential tax revenue (Rs '000) | Index of tax collection (174) | Difference between potential tax estimated and actual revenue (Rs '000) | Difference as percentage of potential tax estimate (64) | Difference as percentage of actual tax collected (61) |
|---------|--------------------------------|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) |
| 1976-77 | 14,745 | 10,13,065 | 10,13,065 | 40,522 | 36.40 | 25,774 | 63.31 | 174.77 |
| 1977-78 | 16,846 | 15,62,223 | 15,62,223 | 62,488 | 26.96 | 45,642 | 73.04 | 270.94 |
| 1978-79 | 14,870 | 15,44,749 | 13,44,749 | 53,789 | 27.64 | 38,919 | 72.36 | 266.73 |
| 1979-80 | 15,402 | 10,03,507 | 10,03,507 | 40,140 | 38.38 | 24,738 | 81.63 | 160.62 |