

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

\*\*\*

Complaint No. : 19/2025

Date : 25.03.2025

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

**Shri Justice L. Narayana Swamy**  
**Member**


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

**Shri Pankaj Kumar**  
**Member**

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

**ORDER**

1. Vide Order dated 11.03.2025, the Full Bench directed the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) to obtain the comments of the Competent Authority and submit the same with the observations thereon within two weeks from the date of the Order as it was not submitted at the time of submission of the PI Report dated 06.03.2025.

 1

2. The Full Bench also directed the Registry to forward the two communications dated 20.02.2025 and 03.02.2025 received from the Complainant to IO for his comments which may be filed along with other submissions.
3. In compliance thereof, the CBI vide letter dated 21.03.2025 has furnished the comments of the Competent Authority and also the observations of the IO thereupon in this matter. Further, the IO has also given his comments on the two communications dated 20.02.2025 and 03.02.2025 of the Complainant.
4. The Registry has placed before us a communication vide email dated 24.03.2025 from the Complainant containing additional information related to this complaint regarding fraudulent land acquisition and encroachment by BPCL.
5. The complaint is against the Project Manager of Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited (BPCL) and its contractor. The complainant has alleged that his agricultural land is being used illegally by the contractor of BPCL because of the inaction of the Public Servant. He has also alleged that continuous trespass on his land by the authority concerned is leading to disruption in his agricultural activities and damage to the land. He has further alleged that the willful inaction by the Public Servant has led to undue advantage to the contractor which includes costs saving for material storage and worker's accommodation at the expense of his property rights. It is further alleged that such offence of improper and negligent

performance of the Public Servant is duly covered under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

6. The Full Bench considered the allegations mentioned in the complaint and vide Order dated 31.01.2025 directed the CBI to inquire into the complaint under Section 20(1) of the Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act, 2013 (referred to as Act of 2013) and submit a Preliminary Inquiry Report within a period of five weeks.
7. We have perused the PI Report. The IO has collected various documents and information on the issues referred in the complaint, examined witnesses and persons acquainted with the related matters, undertook site visit to grasp the on-going situation and took photographs, sought comments and views of the RPS and of the Competent Authority on the allegations raised in the complaint and has found the allegations made in the complaint not substantiated.
8. The PI Report states that BPCL acquired the right of use (RoU) to lay pipelines in several parcels of land including land situated in survey No.214 of Vookondi Village, Nalgonda, Telangana. These parcels of land come under Government land, which have been assigned to local farmers and persons by the State Government for limited agricultural purposes only, without creating any ownership right of such assignees on the land. The sub-survey No.214/68 measuring 3000 Square Meters was allotted to BPCL by the State Government on payment of Rs.5,91,750/- as compensation to the existing assignees. The complainant has

been an assignee in the adjacent land having sub-survey number 214/52.

9. The site visit by the IO revealed that BPCL is constructing the civil work for installing the Sectionalizing Valves Stations number SV-14 using only 2988.566 Square Meters of land out of 3000 Square Meters of land assigned to BPCL. Therefore, the allegation that BPCL has trespassed into the land of the complainant i.e. land parcel at sub survey No.214/52 and damaged the soil, have not been substantiated during the inquiry.
10. Moreover, no temporary construction for the house workers of the BPCL and its contractors on the land assigned to the complainant as alleged was noticed. It is further noted in the PI Report that no agricultural activity is being undertaken on the land assigned to the complainant and no crop was found at the site, though the land was assigned by the State Government to the assignee for the specific limited purposes of agricultural use.
11. The RPS has denied any damage either to the soil or to the crop in the adjoining land. He further commented that BPCL left sufficient land margin on the periphery of its own land, acquired on an allotment basis, to avoid any inconvenience to the adjacent land assignee. He further commented that a complaint alleging dumping of construction material by the civil contractor in nearby land was received and after receipt of the said complaint, necessary instruction was passed to the civil contractor to address

the issue, and it was ensured that the contractor shifted the material to BPCL allotted land.

12. The Competent Authority has agreed with the factual findings recorded by the CBI and has commented that the allegations against the RPS are false, baseless and do not carry any substance. The Competent Authority has commented that BPCL and the appointed contractor have limited their activities including construction and storage of construction materials for SV-14 within the limits of land parcels handed over by the State Government. The Competent Authority has further commented that no damage to the soil or crop, no construction of any temporary houses or sheds for workers and no trespass to any adjacent land during construction of SV-14 has happened by BPCL or appointed contractor.
13. The IO has mentioned that the comments of the Competent Authority are in line with the findings of the Inquiry conducted by the CBI and the comments of the Competent Authority are factually correct.
14. The IO has further commented that the communication dated 03.02.2025 and 20.02.2025 of the complainant do not provide any fresh material to launch any investigation or conduct a further inquiry. The additional information submitted by the complainant vide email dated 24.03.2025 has been made at the advanced stage of the final decision. Hence, the Bench is not taking note of it.

15. We have perused the complaint, and the documents annexed therewith, the PI Report, Comments of the RPS, Comments of the Competent Authority and the observations of the IO on the Competent Authority.
16. We find no reason to disagree with the findings arrived at in the PI Report that the allegations against the BPCL and the appointed contractor are unsubstantiated. Hence, no further indulgence is required.
17. Accordingly, the complaint is disposed of.

**Sd/-**  
**(Justice A.M. Khanwilkar)**  
**Chairperson**

**Sd/-**  
**(Justice L. Narayana Swamy)**  
**Member**

**Sd/-**  
**(Justice Sanjay Yadav)**  
**Member**

**Sd/-**  
**(Pankaj Kumar)**  
**Member**

**Sd/-**  
**(Ajay Tirkey)**  
**Member**

  
**(Court Master)**

/RR/