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

Complaint No.	:	59/2024
Date	:	19th April, 2024
Coram	:	**Shri Justice A.M. Khanwilkar** **Chairperson** **Shri Justice L. Narayana Swamy** **Judicial Member** **Shri Sushil Chandra** **Member** **Shri Pankaj Kumar** **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.

3. The complaint dated 01.02.2024 has been received in the Registry of the Lokpal of India by post.

4. The complaint has been made against the Deputy Director General (DDG), Field Unit Dehradun under the Directorate of Ordnance (C&S), Department of Defence Production, Ministry of Defence for alleged deliberate delay in decision making and adoption of dilatory tactics in performance of official duties regarding the complainant's application for disbursement of House Building Advance (HBA) and request for correction of name in the Service Book. The complainant alleges that

his application for disbursement of HBA was wrongly denied and the decision regarding the same was also delayed because the complainant had refused to pay a demand of Rs.20,000/- as a graft. The complainant submits that his request for correcting his name in the Service Book had also not been accepted by the DDG.

5. The complainant had applied for HBA on 07.06.2023 for the purpose of repayment of an existing SBI Home Loan and the same was sanctioned by the Competent Authority on 04.10.2023. The DDG Field Unit Dehradun vide letters dated 12.10.2023 and 03.01.2024 initiated correspondence with the concerned Branch of the SBI for NOC and documentation formalities for the creation of 2nd Charge over the said property and No Objection was given by the SBI Branch on 18.01.2024. Thereafter, it appears that the Field Unit denied the disbursement of HBA declaring the complainant ineligible as per extant rules. The annexed documents reveal his representations to the Field Unit and the Director General Ordnance against the denial of HBA and the responses given by the Field Unit.

6. The complainant has also made representation vide letter dated 01.03.2024 to Director General Ordnance, Directorate of Ordnance (C&S) against the delay in getting the necessary correction of his name in the Service Book.

7. Having perused the complaint and the documents forwarded by the complainant, in our considered opinion, the allegation falls short of offence of corruption qua the named public servant. The remote reference about the demand is attributed to *some officer** who was junior to the complainant, as having jokingly said about it to the complainant. There is no mention in the complaint that the above-mentioned junior officer was the henchman or agent of the named Respondent Public Servant(RPS). Furthermore, it is noticed that the representation made by the complainant to the Director General (Ordnance) makes no reference to the fact that the File was being delayed on account of demand of the named RPS. Taking overall view of the matter, we are of the considered opinion that the basic ingredient of demand of any amount by the RPS directly or indirectly from the complainant, is conspicuously absent. Thus, we decline to interfere in this complaint.

**The name of the officer has not been disclosed for the sake of confidentiality.*

We accordingly dispose of this complaint, as not worthy of further examination, hence disposed of. Ordered accordingly.

Court Master