

**LOKPAL OF INDIA**  
**Plot No. 6, Institutional Area, Phase- II**  
**Vasant Kunj**  
**New Delhi - 110070**  
\*\*\*\*\*

Complaint No. : 153/2024 (arising out of Dy No. 1402024)

Date : 10.07.2024

**Coram** : **Shri Justice A M Khanwilkar**  
**Chairperson**

**Shri Justice L Narayana Swamy**  
**Judicial Member**

**Shri Justice Sanjay Yadav**  
**Judicial Member**

**Shri Sushil Chandra**  
**Member**

**Shri Justice Ritu Raj Awasthi**  
**Judicial Member**

**Shri Ajay Tirkey**  
**Member**

**ORDER**

The complaint is placed before the Full Bench for consideration of the Scrutiny Report and to pass appropriate order.

2. Perused the Scrutiny Report. We are disposed to condone the defects pointed out by the office in this report and entertain the complaint.



3. The complainant has alleged that the Indian Oil Corporation Limited (IOCL), Allahabad had conducted an interview on 26.10.2005 for appointment to the post of Director, Kisan Seva Kendra. The complainant has stated that she had scored 63.03 marks whereas **XXXXXX** (*name redacted for confidentiality*) had scored 62.33 marks in the interview.

4. The complainant has alleged that the SDRSM, Allahabad office, however, declared the results which were not in accordance with Rule 17 of the brochure. Aggrieved with the aforesaid results the complainant had requested for interview to be held again. The complainant has alleged that even the subsequent interview was not in accordance with the Rule 17 of the brochure. Also, the result declared does not have the signature of the members of the Dealer Selection Committee.

5. The complainant has alleged that the elder brother of husband of **XXXXXX** (*name redacted for confidentiality*) is a sitting MLA and the irregularity has been committed due to his undue political influence. The complainant has further stated that this matter has been inquired by Manager TS/UPSO-1 Lucknow and Senior Manager Indane Bottling Plant, Triveni Nagar, Allahabad and CVO, IOCL, New Delhi. The complainant has alleged that the inquiry was not conducted properly. The complainant has further stated that Hon'ble High Court in ' Manju Shree Vs State of Andhra



Pradesh' and others in 2008, SCC/512 held that after the commencement of selection process (Publication of advertisement) the selection Rules can not be amended. The complainant has also stated that she has filed Writ Petition in the Hon'ble High Court and that respondent **XXXXXXX** (*name redacted for confidentiality*) was able to get order in her favour by misleading the Hon'ble Court. The complainant has further stated that in Writ Petition **XXXXXXX** (*name/details redacted for confidentiality*) and officials of IOCL were able to get ex-parte order from the Hon'ble High Court on 22.11.2022 by misleading the Court.

6. The complainant has further alleged that the respondents managed to get commissioning of Kisan Service Centre, by exercising undue influence on SDRSM/IOCL. The complainant has further alleged that the matter is under inquiry by Chief General Manager (Vigilance), IOCL, New Delhi, since 15.09.2023. which however, is not being held transparently due to undue influence of the respondents. The complainant has finally prayed for a transparent and impartial investigation to be done urgently.

7. Having perused the complaint, we are of the considered opinion that the matter pertains to the cause of action occurred in the year 2005, when the appointment process for the post of Director, Kisan Seva Kendra was initiated; including that the said appointment of Director, Kisan Seva Kendra was the subject matter of proceedings before the High Court.



8. Suffice it to observe that more than seven years have elapsed from the occurrence of the incident in question. Resultantly, it is not open to the Lokpal to entertain such grievance by virtue of Section 53 of the Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act, 2013.

9. Accordingly, this complaint is disposed of being barred by limitation.

  
(Court Master)