

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

Complaint No. : 82/2024 (arising out of Dy.No.752024)

Date : 26th April, 2024

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

Shri Justice Sanjay Yadav
Judicial Member

Shri Sushil Chandra
Member

Shri Justice Ritu Raj Awasthi
Judicial 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 and gone through the records.
3. The complaint is against the ATP and Building Inspector of Municipal Corporation, Jalandhar regarding inadequate responses to complaints made by the complainant. However, the complainant has not specifically mentioned the nature of the complaint for which he is seeking a response from the public servants. The complainant alleges that despite numerous attempts and office visits, responses from the aforementioned public



servants have been consistently irrelevant, incomplete and lacking in justification. The complainant has requested that a review of the complaint handling procedure be undertaken and has urged for disciplinary action against concerned so as to ensure that future responses by the public servants are comprehensive and transparent.

4. The complainant has highlighted a specific instance where the ATP has failed to provide adequate explanation or resolution to the complaints submitted in complaint No.20240300655 through online portal. The complainant has stated that the ATP has replied to the said complaint (in Gurmukhi, Punjabi language translated below in English) as follows:

It is informed that the above case is under consideration of the Lokpal, Punjab, Chandigarh. After finalization of the case appropriate action would be taken.

The complainant has stated that by way of the above mentioned reply the ATP has updated the status as resolved. That, this inadequate communication not only fails to address the concerns raised by the complainant but also contributes to a sense of frustration and mistrust among the residents. The complainant has stated that the reply given by the ATP is totally irrelevant and that he does not know anything about the aforesaid case. He has stated that as a concerned citizen, he values the efficient functioning of the municipal services and is troubled by the apparent disregard for accountability and transparency in handling complaints and is of the view that the aforesaid ATP is trying to conceal information through this incomplete response. The complainant states that the residents rely on the Municipal Corporation to address their concerns promptly and effectively and it is disheartening to see a persistent disregard for this responsibility. The complainant has requested that the Municipal Corporation undertake a thorough review of the procedures and practices governing the handling of complaints and has urged the concerned to take appropriate disciplinary measures to



address the shortcomings in the performance of the ATP concerned so as to ensure that future responses to complaints are comprehensive, relevant and transparent.

5. Perused the complaint. It is noted that the complainant has not enclosed any list/particulars of documents relied upon by him in support of his allegations.

6. The allegation in the complaint is against public servants of the State of Punjab and not against public servants working in connection with the affairs of the Union, falling under Section 14(1) of the Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act, 2013. As such, the Lokpal of India has no jurisdiction to entertain this complaint. Moreover, there is no specific allegation of corruption in the complaint.

7. Accordingly, the complaint is disposed of, granting liberty to the complainant to approach the appropriate forum, if he so desires.


(Court Master)