



**TELECOMMUNICATION ENGINEERING SERVICES ASSOCIATION  
(INDIA)  
Central Headquarters,  
New Delhi**

No. TESA/CHQ/2008

Dated: August 08, 2008

To

Shri Amit Gupta,  
State Secretary, TESA(I),  
West Bengal,  
Kolkata.

Dear comrade,

This refers your e-mail dated 27.7.2008, which has been as usual uploaded in the website of AIBSNLEA, purportedly in connection with holding of CEC/AIC of TESA(I) but factually attempting to malign me. However I cannot expect more than that from you, since people are aware of your very activities from the days you were not even the primary member of TESA(I). Your problem might be that you could not get me replaced in TESA(I) despite your best efforts. Now also I find that you are trying to drag the names of few old comrades who never stood before the representative council to replace me as General Secretary. If your persuasion during those days failed to change their stand, how can I help? So your intention is very much loud and clear. I really do not feel the need to reply such letters. But again certain matters require to be straightened to foil your sinister design and hence I write as under.

2. Yes, the assets of TESA(I) are with me – not illegally as opined by you, but legally as its custodian as per the provision of the Constitution of TESA (I) and because the members of TESA reposed faith in me in Conferences after Conferences held since 1984 despite the opposition from people like you. But I once again can assure one and all that management of the affairs of TESA(I) and its assets are shortly going to be transferred strictly as per the provisions of constitution of TESA(I) and the relevant Sections of Societies Registration Act 1860 under which TESA(I) is registered. No amount of special kind of ‘collective action’ that you recently took during the Circle Secretaries meet of AIBSNLEA held in New Delhi and other arm twisting tactics being adopted by you can change my resolve to follow only the law of the land in this matter. ***I am cent percent sure that you would have practically got no support from other comrades in your recent secret plan, had you divulged your real intention behind that secret plan drawn without their knowledge and approval to invade TESA Bhavan on 12.7.2008 and take over its control as a part of your so called “collective action to recover the assets of TESA(I)” and not as a mere “simple visit to TESA Bhavan” as you are now trying to make it out.***

3. I am happy that you are at least aware that ‘Extra ordinary general body’ and ‘All India Conference’ are not similar events. But then **it is you**, along with some others, **asked for an extra ordinary general body meeting at any convenient location** and when I have taken action to call for the same you are now turning towards AIC. And now you are blaming me that I am mixing both and asking me to clarify which actually I am trying to convene. Well what actually you asked for in your earlier letter dated 11/05/2008? Extra ordinary general

body meeting or AIC? Can you please go through again the letter dated 11/05/2008 signed by you and get yourself clarified? My circular could be amply clear to anybody which I want to convene. You had stated that in your earlier letter you had mentioned the constitutional provision on the matter of deciding the location, but in my reply I had conveniently avoided that point. Well I thought that as a leader of many years you may be well aware of the constitution. I mean the Constitution of TESA(I). You had earlier asked for an extra ordinary general body meeting as per Clause 3 (II) of the Constitution. I clearly mentioned at para 9 of my last circular that though the requisition did not satisfy the condition for an a requisitioned extra ordinary General Body meeting, still to honor the wishes expressed by some of our Circle Secretaries/CEC members/CHQ office bearers for the purpose of “deciding the need to dissolve the association” the extra ordinary general body meeting is being convened. Further the constitutional provision given in clause 3 (II) (a) has been quoted by me in bold letters in para 8 of the same circular. You may go through the constitution again. Clause 3(II) (a) clearly states that “Extra ordinary general body meeting shall be convened **by the General Secretary at any convenient location**”. *The Constitution does not stipulate holding of a CEC for deciding the location of an extra ordinary general body meeting.* You had asked for extra ordinary GB meeting citing clause 3 (II) and when it is being convened, you now ask for an AIC and also ask for holding CEC for deciding the venue of AIC. You had earlier asked for an extra ordinary GB meeting, and now you ask for AIC. Are you withdrawing your earlier letter dated 11/05/2008 for a requisitioned extra ordinary General Body meeting?

4. Regarding the stated commitment made by GS, AFSOA in the CWC Meet of AIBSNLEA at Bangalore to hold their conference along with TESA(I) as mentioned in your letter, I had only pointed out that GS, AIBSNLEA’s communication/reporting is not confirming the same. When there are two reports having different version – one from the General Secretary and another from a Circle Secretary of the same organization, one has to rely on the communication/report of the General Secretary and not the Circle Secretary. If this creates irritation in you, I cannot help. However, I sincerely thank you for admitting that there has been no official communication to me from GS/AIBSNLEA in the line of yours. You also expected me to act in this matter on the basis of information received from my ‘sources’. I am only afraid that, since some of your recent decisions made in the inner meetings avoiding even your the Headquarter Circle Secretary from participating in those meetings suspecting him to be the potential source of leaking out your strategies/plans had leaked out, you may start suspecting every body even within your present closed circle and try to keep them also out one by one from your internal discussion. *As regards your assumption that TESA money is being paid to some ‘sources’ for supplying information and your further advise to cut their wages, one can only feel pity on you. You may be now indulging in this very practice in the new environment by doling out liberal ‘honorarium’, rewards for being away from home and comforts of all sorts to the selected few to garner support. Otherwise such baseless and imaginary insinuation would not have come from you.*

5. You have again raised the question of continuation of Circle Secretary, TESA(I) Tamilnadu Circle as the member of TESA (I) since he left AIBSNLEA and joined AIBSNLOA. You have now quoted the case of Com N H Siddique, Asst Circle Secretary, TESA (I) West Bengal State Branch who was also the Circle Secretary, AIBSNLEA, West Bengal Circle. He is stated to have resigned from AIBSNLEA and joined SNEA. In this case also, I do not find any cause of action by TESA (I). He left AIBSNLEA – an association of the Executives of BSNL and joined another association of Executives in BSNL only. Since he did not leave TESA(I) and also that TESA(I) is not operative in BSNL after absorption of

the Group B Officers, there can be no cause of action. TESA(I) would have certainly considered action as per provisions of its constitution had they left TESA(I) and joined other rival Associations before absorption of the Group B Officers in BSNL.

6. **You have asserted that in Kolkata CEC of TESA(I) decision was taken for merger of TESA(I) with AIBSNLEA. As a result of that next day, the convention of AIBSNLEA was held. You have further stated that Kolkata CEC considered about the members in DoT and consciously took decision for merger. I am sorry that these are not the facts. The issue of merger was not even in the agenda for discussion in the CEC and the Report of the General Secretary that was considered in that meeting had not dealt anything on the issue of merger. You always quote constitution of TESA(I) for each and everything. Will you please quote the provision of the constitution which empowers CEC to take this vital decision for merger? Again by keeping out DoT and MTNL members, how decision can be taken for merger and that too in CEC? Convention of AIBSNLEA was planned and scheduled much in advance. It was not conditional that the convention will be held only if decision for merger by the associations of DoT Officers is taken. Therefore, what I have clarified in my letter to BSNL about the stated merger of TESA (I) and formation of AIBSNLEA, each and every one of those are correct and based on facts.** Your apprehension that the AIBSNLEA will be destabilized because of that letter is not correct. After all, formation of AIBSNLEA is not dependent on merger of Associations of DoT Officers. **Regarding use of the word “merger” in AIBSNLEA documents by me as its General Secretary, I may say that this has to be understood from the perspective of their respective context. I do not know whether you have now got that mind set to allow you to appreciate that. After all, you seem to be at present fully obsessed with the word ‘merger’. You have further tried to make your point by stating that I designated “the GS of another Association as ‘the then’ and ‘former’ as that Association was merged into AIBSNLEA”. I am sure that you are referring to para 2.1 of the Report of GS, AIBSNLEA placed in Hyderabad AIC. But I once again feel sorry for you since here also you have totally missed the point. The use of words “the then” and “former” in fact was in respect of two different incumbents holding the post of General Secretary of that Association during two different periods and both of them were not the General Secretary of that Association when the Report was placed in the AIC. It was having no connection whatsoever with ‘merger’ or no merger. The case of TESA(I) cannot be compared with this development, since it was the only Association with the then Central Coordination Committee of DoT Officers’ Associations which was registered under the Societies Registration Act 1860 and is bound to follow the laid down constitutional procedure and the specific provision of the Act on the issue in question. You have further stated that because of property of TESA (I) being under my possession people are still remembering TESA(I) and me. Otherwise they would have forgotten both. This clearly indicates that you are still remembering TESA(I) only for the sake of its property. If you get the property, you are ready to forget TESA(I). What a commitment you really had to an association and its members which gave you an identity! I do not blame you for your honest admission, after all today even the off springs do often forget their parents once they are able to grab their properties. I am not bothered whether people like you will remember me or not. But I know that I have a permanent place in the hearts of thousands of friends, juniors and seniors alike in and outside TESA(I).**

7. Well I am not surprised by your mudslinging in last para of your letter. I am practiced to taking it right from 1991. Every AICs of TESA from 1991 had witnessed mudslinging on me and to your dismay the general membership had rightly rejected it. Finally, I would like to

say that you should better pray for yourself that “May God bestow some good sense and wisdom” on you.

With best wishes,

Yours comradely,



(S Basu)  
General Secretary

Copy to:

1. Shri K Balasubramanian,  
President, TESA(I).
2. All other CHQ Office bearers/Circle Secretaries of TESA(I).