

BEFORE THE LOKAYUKTA, DELHI
JUSTICE MANMOHAN SARIN
COMPLAINT NO. C-266/LOK/2009

In Re:-

Dr. Harshvardhan

... Complainant

Vs.

Smt. Sheila Dikshit, Chief Minister

... Respondent

Present:- Ms. Sunita Bhardwaj, Advocate for Complainant

Sh. Deepak Aggarwal, Advocate for Respondent

Written arguments have been filed by the Respondent's Counsel Mr. Mehmood Pracha in support of the reply on merits to the application of the Complainant. These are taken on record and will be considered in due course.

An application has been moved by Respondent's Counsel seeking permission for oral arguments and for videography of the court proceedings. Oral arguments by the Respondent's Counsel were held to be not possible on the last date in the facts, circumstances and reasons mentioned in the order dated 30.9.2013. Respondent's Counsel, in the application seeking permission for oral arguments, has attempted to give a version contrary to the factual position.

It is not considered necessary to controvert the version of the Respondent on 30.9.2013 as is sought to be presented by the Respondent's counsel in the application. It is sufficient to note that the version set out in the application moved by the Respondent's Counsel is contrary to the factual position which has been succinctly recorded in the order dated 30.09.2013. This forum does not consider it necessary to join issue by controverting each of the averments and mis-statements and the distortion of facts sought to be urged by the Respondent's Counsel. It is an unabashed attempt to undermine the dignity and challenge the sanctity of the record of this forum.

It is not even considered necessary to issue notice to the Complainant's counsel on this application though the allegations in the application have been made against her conduct, as rebuttal of the same would result in digressing the inquiry before this forum.

MS

Prayer made for allowing oral arguments on the reply on merits to the application has already been declined as noted in the order dated 30.9.2013. There is no fresh ground or reason to allow the same.

It is with anguish, but with the hope, that one day perhaps realization will dawn upon the Counsel for Respondent that he has a sacrosanct duty, as a member of the legal fraternity, to protect the dignity of the court and not to compromise the same for some misconceived notion of petty gain for his client.

The prayer for videography at the fag end, when the inquiry proceedings barring the application being dealt with, are complete, is wholly misplaced and has been made just to embarrass the court. The same is rejected.

Order in the inquiry as also in the application are reserved.


(Justice Manmohan Sarin)

Lokayukta, Delhi

11th October, 2013

PKs