

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

\*\*\*

Complaint No. : 16/2024.

Date : 20<sup>th</sup> March, 2024.

**Coram** : **Justice A.M. Khanwilkar**  
**Hon'ble Chairperson**

**Justice Abhilasha Kumari**  
**Judicial Member**

**Smt. Archana Ramasundaram**  
**Member**

**Mahender Singh**  
**Member**

**Justice L. Narayana Swamy,**  
**Judicial Member**

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

**Sushil Chandra**  
**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 remarks made by the office in this report and entertain the complaint being tenable.
3. The complainant of this complaint appears to be a litigant before the Hon'ble High Court of Calcutta. The complaint is directed against a Government Pleader appointed by the State Ministry of Judicial Law of that State for the Hon'ble High Court of Calcutta, who has been named in the complaint.
4. The allegations in the complaint are to the effect that an order, pronounced in the Open Court, has been forged, tampered with and altered, with the connivance of the rival party. It is alleged that forgery has been committed and that the public servant, apart from having committed offences under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, has also committed contempt of the Hon'ble Court, for which action ought to be taken.
5. Though the complaint is not very clear and specific in material facts and particulars, it is evident that it pertains to pending litigation before the Hon'ble High Court of Calcutta, in which the complainant is involved. The named person is a Government Pleader appointed by the State for representing it in the High Court. Thus, he is not an officer falling under clauses (a) to (h) of sub-section (1) of Section 14 of the Act of 2013. It further appears that a police complaint and an FIR have already been filed.
6. We have perused the complaint and considered its contents. Taking into consideration the nature of the complaint and the aspect that it is against a person not covered under Section 14(1)(h) of the Act of 2013 and also it pertains to the alleged forgery



of a judicial order, we are of the view that the complaint does not fall within the purview of the mandate accorded to the Lokpal of India, under the Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act, 2013.

7. The complainant appears to have already taken recourse to filing a police complaint and FIR, which will take its own course. He is also at liberty of avail of any other remedy that may be available to him.

8. Hence, the Full Bench of the Lokpal of India is not inclined to entertain the complaint.

9. Accordingly, the complaint is disposed of.

  
COURT MASTER,  
LOKPAL OF INDIA.