LOKPAL OF INDIA

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

Complaint No.	:	156/2023
Date	:	29th August, 2023
Coram	:	**Justice Pradip Kumar Mohanty** **Acting Chairperson** **Justice Abhilasha Kumari** **Judicial Member** **Shri Dinesh Kumar Jain** **Member** **Smt. Archana Ramasundaram** **Member** **Shri Mahender Singh** **Member**

ORDER

The complaint is against several offices and dignitaries, namely the Indian Railway Administration Chairman and CEO, New Delhi, Principal Chief Personnel Officer, South Central Railways, Divisional Railway Manager (Personnel) of Hyderabad Division and Nanded Division, Kendriya Prashasinik Adhikari, CAT of Mumbai Bench and Hyderabad Bench, Hon'ble High Courts of Mumbai, Hyderabad and Aurangabad, Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, Bar Council of India, New Delhi, Bar Council of Maharashtra and Goa (Mumbai) and the Indian Judicial System.

2. From the perusal of the complaint and the documents enclosed, it appears that this complaint is in continuation of two earlier complaints received by the Lokpal from the complainant, who is a retired railway

employee. Both these complaints, i.e. complaint Nos.116/2021 and 117/2021, were against the Divisional Railway Manager (Mandal Rail Prabandhak), South Central Railway, Nanded Division, Maharashtra and the Divisional Railway Manager (Mandal Rail Prabandhak), South Central Railway, Hyderabad Division, Secunderabad, Telangana.

3. Complaint No.116 pertained to non-receipt of benefit of MACP (Modified Assured Career Progression Scheme) due to non-consideration of the complainant's earlier service by the South Central Railway Administration. Similarly, complaint No.117 was regarding non-receipt of benefit of PF, CGIS (Group Insurance) and LAP (Leave on Average Pay) on account of the previous service of the complainant with the Railways. Both the complaints related to administrative matters and there was no specific allegation of corruption. As these did not appear to fall under the domain of the Lokpal, no intervention was found to be necessary. Accordingly, both these complaints were disposed of vide two separate orders dated 30.11.2021 of the Full Bench of the Lokpal of India, giving liberty to the complainant to approach the appropriate forum for redressal of his grievance.

4. Subsequently, the complainant filed an application seeking review of both the orders dated 30.11.2021 passed by the Lokpal. This was placed before the Division Bench of the Lokpal on 02.03.2022 and vide an Order of the same date, it was clarified that in the absence of any provision in the Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act, 2013, granting an express and substantive power of review, his application for review of the said Judgement/Orders passed by the Bench of the Lokpal of India could not be entertained.

5. From the perusal of the instant complaint and the voluminous documents enclosed with it, it appears that the complainant has been filing several complaints against various authorities over the years. It appears that he has also sent his representation to various dignitaries such as the Hon'ble President of India, Vice-President of India, Lok Sabha Speaker and various other offices. It is interesting to note that the complainant has also

approached the International Court of Justice, Netherlands and International Human Rights Commission, Switzerland for redressal of his grievance.

6. Moreover, the enclosed documents reveal that vide an Order dated 20.08.1993, the Hon'ble CAT Bombay Bench had rejected his application challenging the order dated 22.02.1993 of South Central Railways terminating his services as Librarian in the Railway Higher Secondary School, Hyderabad Division. The complainant then approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court and the Court disposed of his petition on 01.03.1996 as no case was made for interference with the judgment of the Hon'ble CAT Bombay Bench, with directions that he could be considered for any other post for which he possessed the necessary qualification. Based on this Order, he was reappointed in the service as an Assistant Teacher w.e.f. 16.10.1996.

7. It appears that the complainant then filed his application vide OA No.982/2001 before the Hon'ble CAT, Hyderabad Bench seeking to count his past services as Librarian for the purpose of fixation of his pay and for pensionary benefits which was dismissed vide Order dated 13.07.2001 as he was not entitled for such benefits. Later, the complainant has filed applications before the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature, Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad, Hon'ble CAT Hyderabad Bench and before the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Bombay, Bench at Aurangabad which were dismissed/rejected for want of merit in the petitions filed.

8. Having perused the complaint and the documents enclosed, the Full Bench is of the view that the complaint, which is more of an administrative nature, does not appear to fall under the purview of the Lokpal of India as there is no specific allegation of corruption. Besides, the complainant has already approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court, Hon'ble High Court of Judicature, Andhra Pradesh at Hyderabad, Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Bombay, Bench at Aurangabad and Hon'ble CAT Hyderabad Bench. Therefore, we are not inclined to intervene.

9. Accordingly, the complaint stands disposed of with the directions to the complainant to desist from sending complaints relating to service matters repeatedly to the office of the Lokpal.

COURT MASTER
LOKPAL OF INDIA