

Lokpal of India
Plot No.6, Vasant Kunj Institutional Area – Phase-II
New Delhi – 110070

Complaint No. : 52/2025 (arising out of Dy.No.912025)

Date : 07.03.2025

Coram : Shri Justice A.M. Khanwilkar
Chairperson

Shri Justice Sanjay Yadav
Member

Shri Sushil Chandra
Member

Shri Justice Ritu Raj Awasthi
Member

Shri Pankaj Kumar
Member

Shri Ajay Tirkey
Member

ORDER

1. The earlier Scrutiny Report, dated 03.03.2025, indicated that the complaint, as presented, is defective for the following reasons:

“

1. The complaint has been received through LokpalOnline portal,



however, the physical copy of the same has not been received (Due Date: 14.03.2025). Since, the parts of the complaint form are generated by LokpalOnline portal, the same are unsigned.”

2. The Scrutiny Report also indicates that the complainant can remove the stated defect upto 14.03.2025, as mentioned in paragraph 2 above.
3. Now, the Revised Scrutiny Report, dated 05.03.2025, states that complainant has submitted the signed physical copy of the complaint, curing the defect stated in the earlier Scrutiny Report dated 03.03.2025. Hence, we proceed to examine the case on merit.
4. This complaint, dated 27.02.2025, is against the high official(s) of Indian Institute of Technology (for short, IIT), Delhi, Department of Higher Education, Delhi, Central Vigilance Commission and Minister Ministry of Education.
5. The complainant has, inter alia alleged irregularities in the process of recruitment for the post of Deputy Registrar as advertised on 07.03.2020 in IIT, Delhi.
6. We have carefully considered the complaint and the accompanying documents. Two aspects emerge from the analysis. First, the

complainant seems to be a disgruntled person. The most important aspect, to our mind, is that the allegations in the complaint even if taken at its face value or as it is, do not disclose commission of offence of corruption within the meaning of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. At best, it may be a case of some irregularity or subjective satisfaction exercised by the RPS and other high officials in making an appointment of another candidate, instead of the Complainant. It is not the case of the complainant that one of the named public servant wanted to favour any particular candidate or had prevailed upon other selection committee panel members to do so. Making a general assertion that irregularities have been committed in the selection process is not enough to deduce vigilance angle. There are no verifiable facts indicative of acts of commission and omission by any one of the named public servant entailing in offence of corruption.

7. Suffice it to observe that, the allegations contained in the complaint do not persuade us to initiate any action warranting Inquiry - in absence of any case of commission and omission constituting an offence muchless tangible material to substantiate offence of corruption. In our opinion, no case is made out regarding

commission of offence of corruption, under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

8. Accordingly, this complaint must fail and is, therefore, disposed of.

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

Sd/-
(Justice Sanjay Yadav)
Member

Sd/-
(Sushil Chandra)
Member

Sd/-
(Justice Ritu Raj Awasthi)
Member

Sd/-
(Pankaj Kumar)
Member

Sd/-
(Ajay Tirkey)
Member


(Court Master)

/SN/