<u>21.08.2023</u>

[1] Shri L.N. Ngamba, learned counsel appears on behalf of the Complainant. Shri Th. Deepak Singh, learned counsel entered appearance on behalf of Respondent No. 2, Shri P. Sana Singh (Retired MCS), the then SDO TML; Shri Irom Denning, learned counsel entered appearance on behalf of Respondent No. 3, Shri Robertson Asem, MCS, the then SDO, TML; Shri N. Suresh Meetei, learned counsel entered appearance on behalf of Respondent Nos. 4, Shri Thuankulung Gangmei; and 5, Shri Kh. Lovejoy. None appears for Respondent No. 1, Shri Armstrong Pame, IAS, the then DC(LA), TML.

[2] All the learned counsels appearing for the Respondents except Respondent No.1, Shri Armstrong Pame, IAS, submitted at bar that they have not yet been furnished a copy of the Complaint Petition. But it is made very clear that during the course of the preliminary inquiry, case of the complainant in the complaint had been made known to the respondents. However, for the ends of justice, we are of the considered view that a copy of complaint shall also be furnished to all the Respondents, who are represented by their counsels today. Accordingly, Registry is directed to furnish a copy of the complaint petition to the learned counsels within 48 hours. The respondents are requested to collect a copy of the complaint petition within the aforesaid period from the Registry so as to avoid wastage of time in furnishing the said complaint petition. Since, all the respondents, except, respondent No. 1, had already been represented by their counsel, the respondents through their counsels can collect their copies of the complaint petition.

[3] As prayed for by the learned counsels appearing for the respondents, except respondent No. 1, list this case on 04.09.2023 for filing of comments to the Preliminary Inquiry Report, if any.

[4] We have also perused the office note dated 18.08.2023, wherein it is stated that Respondent No. 1 (Shri Armstrong Pame, IAS) through his letter dated 17.08.2023 addressed to the Deputy Registrar, Manipur Lokayukta had requested Manipur Lokayukta to grant him time of at least 2 months for his appearance in person as he would like to go through the various allegations put forth by the complainant. Serious allegation has been made in the complaint that there was misappropriation of the fund for an amount of Rs. 36,83,62,250.72/- (Rupees thirty-six core eighty three lakh sixty-two thousand two hundred fifty and seventy two paise only) provided for compensation of the lands and standing properties belonging to the villagers of Marangching affected by the construction of Railway Tracks from chainage No. 98080 to 105419 (137.09 acre) of Jiribam to Toupul in the Makhuam/Marangching Village of the then Tamenglong District and now Noney District, Manipur, by the Respondent Nos. 4 and 5 by hatching a conspiracy with the respondent No. 1, Shri Armstrong Pame, the then Deputy Commissioner, Tamenglong and other respondents. Addl. Superintendent of Police, attached to the Manipur Lokayukta, Shri P. Shanker had conducted a thorough preliminary inquiry and submitted a Preliminary Inquiry Report with supporting documents comprising of 276 Pages. As provided under section 20 (3) of the Manipur Lokayukta Act, 2014, we have furnished copies of the Preliminary Inquiry report to the public servants against whom preliminary inquiry report has been submitted. This is also in compliance of the fair proceeding and also the provision of the Manipur Lokayukta Act, 2014.

[5] Deputy Registrar, Manipur Lokayukta, under his letter dated 02.08.2023, asked the Respondent No. 1, Shri Armstrong Pame,

IAS to file comment to the said Preliminary Inquiry Report, by appearing personally or through the counsel before Manipur Lokayukta on 21.08.2023. For convenience letter dated 02.08.2023 of the Deputy Registrar, Manipur Lokayukta is reproduced hereunder:

"No. 1/Dy. Reg/Corr/Mn.Lokayukta/2022. OFFICE OF THE MANIPUR LOKAYUKTA 3rd FLOOR, DIRECTORATE COMPLEX, 2nd M.R., NORTH A.O.C, IMPHAL

Imphal, 2nd August, 2023

То

- 1. Shri. Lanranglung Gondaimei (Complainant)
 - 2. Shri. Armstrong Pame, IAS, the then DC/(LA), TML
 - 3. Shri. P. Sana Singh (Retired MCS), the then SDO, TML
 - 4. Shri. Robertson Asem, MCS, the then SDO, TML
 - 5. Shri. Thuankulung Gangmei
 - 6. Shri. Kh. Lovejoy.

Subject: Manipur Lokayukta's order dated 31.07.2023 passed in Complaint Case No. 1 of 2022.

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith the above cited order and request you to collect the above cited order along with the Preliminary Inquiry Report so as to file your comment at the first hearing schedule on 21.08.2023.

Further, you are directed to appear personally or through your Counsel before the Lokayukta along with your comment to the Preliminary Inquiry Report on 21.08.2023 at 11:30 A.M. without fail.

Yours faithfully, Sd/-(Songeireng Khupboi Aimol) Deputy Registrar: Manipur Lokayukta

Enclosed: As stated.

Copy to:

- 1. P.S. to Hon'ble Chairperson, Manipur Lokayukta.
- 2. P.S. to Hon'ble Member, Manipur Lokayukta.
- 3. Guard file."

[6] In the said letter dated 02.08.2023, it has been made known to the Respondent No. 1, Shri Armstrong Pame, IAS that he can appear personally or through this counsel before Manipur Lokayukta on 21.08.2023. In other words, his personnel appearance before Manipur Lokayukta on this date i.e. 21.08.2023 may not be required. As recorded above, all the respondents, except respondent No. 1 appeared before Manipur Lokayukta through their counsels. Therefore, asking 2 (two) months' time for personnel appearance before before Manipur Lokayukta by the Respondent No. 1 under his letter dated 17.08.2023 is not tenable in the eyes of law.

[7] Regarding the TA/DA for the travel for personal appearance before Manipur Lokayukta mentioned in his letter dated 17.08.2023, it is made clear that there is no provision in the Manipur Lokayukta Act and Rules framed therein for payment of TA/DA to the respondents accused for their appearance before Manipur Lokayukta. Therefore, it is made clear that there is no question of his TA/DA for his appearance before Manipur Lokayukta. It is reiterated that he can appear before Manipur Lokayukta through his counsel and file his comment to the Preliminary Inquiry Report, copy of which had already been received by him.

[8] Under the provision of Manipur Lokayukta Act, 2014, it is made clear that there are certain limitation periods for completing the different stages of complaint case. Therefore, Manipur Lokayukta is making an endeavour to comply with the provision as provided under Section 20 (3) of the Manipur Lokayukta Act, 2014 within the period prescribed under the Act. In such circumstances, there is no question of granting such a long period of 2 (two) months to the respondent no. 1 for filing his comment to the Preliminary

Inquiry Report. Therefore, in order to maintain parity for all the respondents of the complaint, where we have granted 12 days' time for filing their comment to the Preliminary Inquiry Report, we also grant 12 days' time to the Respondent No.1 for filing his comment to the Preliminary Inquiry Report. Accordingly, respondent No. 1 has to file his comment to the Preliminary Inquiry Report on or before the date mentioned above i.e. 04.09.2023. It is also made clear that if the respondent No. 1, Shri Armstrong Pame does not file his comment to the Preliminary Inquiry Report and/or is represented by his counsel within the period indicated above, the complaint case will be proceeded in his absence.

[9] Registry is directed to communicate this order along with the scanned copy of the complaint petition by e-mail to the Respondent No. 1, Shri Armstrong Pame, IAS, the then DC(LA), TML (e-mail – <u>armstrong.pame@nic.in</u>) and also to Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India (email – <u>secy.inb@nic.in</u>), for necessary information and compliance.

[10] List this case on 04.09.2023 for filing of comment, if any, to the Preliminary Inquiry Report.

Sd/-MEMBER

Sd/-CHAIRPERSON