

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

\*\*\*

**Complaint No.** : 76/2025 (arising out of Dy.No.1462025)

**Date** : 11<sup>th</sup> April, 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. This complaint registered as Dy. No. 1462025 has been placed before the Bench along with Scrutiny Report dated 03.04.2025. The Scrutiny Report records following defects in the complaint under consideration:

1) *The name of the public servant against whom the complaint has been filed has not been provided.*



- 2) While the term "Registrar" has been mentioned as the present designation of the public servant in question, this designation remains ambiguous, and no further details have been furnished.
  - 3) The post held by the public servant at the time of commission of the offence has not been specified.
  - 4) The complainant has not enclosed a signed statement of allegations.
  - 5) The complaint has been received through LokpalOnline portal, however, the physical copy of the same has not been received (Due date – 16.04.2025). Since the parts of the complaint form are generated by the Lokpal Online Portal, the same are unsigned.
  - 6) The complainant has not provided particulars/list of documents relied upon by him in support of his allegations.
  - 7) The summary of facts and allegations is incomplete and unclear.
2. As per the document enclosed in the complaint form, it appears that the complaint has been lodged against Kotak Mahindra Bank Ltd. and Monarch Network Capital Ltd. alleging grave banking irregularities, including the unauthorized use of an account without the consent of the account holder. The complainant has further alleged acts of forgery and the misuse of his personal information, in addition to violations of multiple provisions of various legislations, including the Companies Act, 2013, the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002, and the Indian Penal Code, 1860..
3. In our view, the named Respondents do not come within the ambit of Section 14 of the Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act, 2013. Hence, they are not amenable to the jurisdiction of the Lokpal of India.



4. No fruitful purpose would be served even if time is granted to the complainant to cure the defects.
5. Consequently, the complaint is disposed for want of jurisdiction.
6. The complainant, however, will be at liberty to approach the appropriate authority for redressal of his grievance, if so advised. We may not be understood to have expressed any view on the merits of the allegations one way or the other.

**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)**

/KS/