

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

\*\*\*

Complaint No. : 69/2025 (Arising out of Dy.No.682025)

Date : 11.04.2025

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. Vide Order dated 28.02.2025, the complainant was given two weeks' time to remove the defects pointed out by the Registry.
2. In compliance with the above directions, the complainant has cured the defects noted in the Order referred to above.
3. The complaint dated 06.02.2025, is received through post. It is made against the Deputy Director of Handlooms and Textiles (*hereinafter*

1  


*referred to as the public servant*) working in the State of Karnataka. The complainant has alleged that the insurance claim concerning her deceased husband, under the Pradhan Mantri Jeevan Jyoti Bima Yojana (PMJJBY) and Pradhan Mantri Suraksha Bima Yojana (PMSBY) has not been released. Hence, the complainant has sought an order from the Lokpal to facilitate her in getting the insurance compensation amount.

4. From the documents enclosed with the complaint, it is seen that the complainant has filed a complaint dated 24.06.2024 with the Hon'ble Lokayukta, Karnataka against the said public servant in the same matter and is registered as Complaint No.UPLOK/BGM/12824/2024.
5. We have perused the complaint and the documents attached therewith. The Bench takes note of the fact that the complainant had already filed a complaint in the same matter with Hon'ble Lokayukta, Karnataka before she made a complaint to the Lokpal. Hence, keeping in mind the purport of Section 15 of the Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act, 2013, we deem it appropriate to decline indulgence to the complainant. For, the named public servant is in the employment of the State Government and jurisdictional Lokayukta may be competent to proceed against him as per the provisions of the law.
6. We also find that the named public servant is not amenable to the jurisdiction of the Lokpal under Section 14 of the Act of 2013, as he is working in connection with the affairs of the State Government; and there is no assertion that the acts of commission and omission

occurred during his service in connection with the affairs of the Union of India.

7. The complaint is disposed of in the above terms.

**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)**

/RR/