


From:
Dr.K.Krishna Kumar
Plot # 179,SBI Colony
Gandhinagar,Kavadiguda
Hyderabad,Andhra Pradesh

Date: 19.01.2012

To:
The Central Vigilance Commissioner
Central Vigilance Commission,
Satarkata Bhavan,GPO Complex,INA
New Delhi.



Sir

Sub: VCI Elections - Corruptive practices to win-by grabbing few thousands of Ballot Papers & attesting fake signatures on the Declaration Forms (Form-III)- scam -involved by Govt.of India officials; postal authorities and members of VCI - 2,754 Declaration Forms with fake Signatures as documentary evidences-submitted-investigation-requested regarding.

Ref: Index of References submitted on the Page No. ²³ of this petition.

1. I respectfully submit that I am one of the contestants with Serial No. 25 on the Ballot Paper in the VCI Elections 2009. I am an employee of Department of Animal Husbandry, Govt. of Andhra Pradesh and Vice-President of Andhra Pradesh Veterinary Council, Hyderabad.
2. Through this petition, I am submitting the corruptive practices & modus operandi adopted by the authorities of Dept.of Animal Husbandry, Dairying & Fisheries(DAHDF), Ministry of Agriculture, Govt.of India, Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi, Quarantine Officer, AQCS (DAHDF, Govt.of India, Ministry of Agriculture), New Delhi, authorities of Post Office, Kapashera, New Delhi and Members of Veterinary Council of India(a statutory body of Govt.of India formed under IVC Act,1984) in the elections conducted for electing 11 members to the Veterinary Council of India.

3. It is humbly submitted that the Veterinary Council of India (hereinafter referred to as VCI for brevity) is a statutory body of Govt. of India established under the Indian Veterinary Act 1984, Dt.18.08.1984 to regulate veterinary practice and for maintenance of registers of the veterinary practitioners and for the matters connected therewith. The VCI consists of 27 members, out of which 12 members are nominated by Central Government; one member each nominated by ICAR and IVA; 2 members are *ex officio* and 11 members are elected by the registered veterinary practitioners.

4. It is submitted that the Election for the 11 members to be conducted by the Govt. of India once in 3 years **through postal ballot** in accordance with the IVC Act 1984 and IVC Rules 1985. **Elections were due in 2009.** After publication of the Final Electoral Roll by VCI, **the Returning Officer issued the Election Notification on 12.10.2009** (enclosed herewith as *Reference-1*) and schedule of Election was as following:

i. Date of Election Notification in the Gazette of India	12.10.09
ii. Last date for submission of Nominations	19.10.09
iii. Date of Scrutiny of Nominations	24.10.09
iv. Last date for Withdrawal of Nominations	26.10.09
v. Posting of Ballot Papers at New Delhi by the Returning Officer	31.10.09
vi. Scheduled Date of Poll	30.11.09

The time available between the date of posting of Ballot papers at New Delhi and the Scheduled date of poll is **30 days only**. In this mean time the posted Ballot papers should reach the electors all over India including North-Eastern States and the same have to be returned after voting, to the Returning Officer at New Delhi before 30.11.2009 by the elector.

5. It is humbly submitted that the A.P.Veterinary Association, Andhra Pradesh and the A.P.Veterinary Council, Andhra Pradesh have received thousands of complaints from the Registered Veterinary Practitioners of A.P. regarding the non-receipt of ballot papers. Then both the Bodies have represented to the Returning Officer on 17.11.2009 (i.e.16 days after the posting of ballot papers at New Delhi and 14 days prior to the scheduled date of poll) about the non-receipt of ballot papers and also expressed their suspicion of rigging the election (enclosed herewith as *Reference-2*). But the response was nil from the Returning Officer for such representations. After observing the insensitiveness towards the issue, I, one of the contestants from A.P. has approached Hon'ble High Court of Andhra Pradesh by filing a writ petition in W.P. No. 25775/2009 (i.e., 21 days after the posting of ballot papers at New Delhi and 7 days prior to the scheduled date of poll) regarding the non-receipt of ballot papers by majority of the Registered Veterinary Practitioners of Andhra Pradesh. The Hon'ble High Court of A.P. was pleased to pass orders Dt.29.12.2009 directing the Secretary, VCI therein to update the addresses of electors of Andhra Pradesh and to send fresh ballot papers to the updated addresses of Registered Veterinary Practitioners of Andhra Pradesh. The same is enclosed herewith as *Reference-3*. Aggrieved by the orders of Hon'ble High Court of A.P., the Secretary, DAHDF and the Returning Officer(1st & 3rd respondents) filed a writ appeal in W.A.No.74/2010 and the Secretary, VCI who was the 2nd respondent in writ petition filed W.A.No.120/2010 before the Division Bench of Hon'ble High Court of A.P.. The Division Bench of Hon'ble

High Court dismissed the W.A.No.74/2010 and a positive direction was given by the Division Bench in W.A.No.120/2010 to implement and comply with the Single Judge Order. The same is enclosed herewith as *Reference-4*. Aggrieved by the orders in W.A.No.120/2010 dt.15.2.2010, the then Secretary, VCI has filed SLP in No.8698/2010 before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The Apex Court dismissed the SLP by its order Dt.05.04.2010. The same is enclosed herewith as *Reference-5*. Even after the directions of Hon'ble Apex Court, neither the Returning Officer nor the Secretary, VCI had initiated any action to implement the orders of the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. and contrary to implementing the orders of the Hon'ble High Court of A.P., they have conducted elections for the posts of President and Vice-President of VCI. At this stage, I filed a contempt petition in C.C.No. 1087/2010 in W.P.No. 25775/2009 before the Hon'ble High Court of A.P.. The Hon'ble High Court of A.P. has directed the Secretary, DAHDF to conduct elections within 30 days pertaining to the Registered Veterinary practitioners of Andhra Pradesh. The same is enclosed herewith as *Reference-6*.

6. It is humbly submitted that there are similar complaints from other States of India such as Karnataka and Gujarat where the majority of Registered Veterinary Practitioners of such States have not received ballot papers(enclosed herewith as *Reference-7*) and such facts were confirmed by the Returning Officer and the Secretary, DAHDF in their Counter Affidavit submitted to the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in W.P.No.25775/2009 admitting that "*in view of a large number of complaints about non-receipt of ballot papers and*

incorrect addresses, the allegation against the VCI may not be entirely baseless. Therefore, the Veterinary Council of India needs to perform their task more diligently. ” The counter affidavit is enclosed herewith as **Reference-8**.

7. It is submitted that as per the directions of the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in C.C.No.1087/2010 in W.P.No. 25775/2009 Dt.29.10.2010, fresh elections are being conducted to Andhra Pradesh State only and the voted ballot papers received by the Returning Officer from rest of India remain valid for counting. A fresh schedule of election was announced by the Returning Officer vide F.No.52-37/2009-LDT(VC)(Vol.II) dated 03.11.2010 (the same is enclosed herewith as **Reference-9**) and as per such notification:

(a) The fresh scheduled date of poll for the Registered Veterinary Practitioners of Andhra Pradesh was 25.11.2010.

(b) The scheduled date of counting of votes of entire country was 26.11.2010.

8. It is humbly submitted that as per **Rule 16(2) of Indian Veterinary Rules,1985**, (a copy of Rules enclosed herewith as **Reference-10**), the gap between the dispatching of the Ballot Paper and the scheduled date of poll should be minimum of 30 days. But, in the case of re-election to Andhra Pradesh such Rule was grossly violated by the Returning Officer just to protect the winning chances of one group of contestants, since the gap provided was 17

days only i.e. Ballot Papers were dispatched on 08.11.2010 and the scheduled date of poll was 25.11.2010, which was not at all adequate to the electors of remote Andhra Pradesh to receive and send the voted Ballot Papers before the scheduled date of poll.

9. It is humbly submitted that for any election, identity of the voter is very important. Regarding General Elections, the identity of the voter will be confirmed by examining the identity proof (anyone of the 15 types of prescribed documents) of the voter before issuing the ballot paper to the voter to avoid rigging. Whereas in this election, there are only two sources to confirm the identity of the voter :

- a. Postal Address of the elector
- b. Signature of the elector attested on the Declaration Paper, which is sent to the Returning Officer along with the voted Ballot Paper.

10. It is humbly submitted that with regard to **'Postal Address of the elector'**-Secretary, VCI has admitted in his Counter Affidavit submitted to the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in W.P.No.25775/2009 about the non-updation of the changed addresses in case of Andhra Pradesh. The remarks made by the Returning Officer and the Secretary, DAHDF, in their Counter affidavit submitted to the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in W.P.No.25775/2009, the preparation of electoral rolls was not done properly by the Veterinary Council of India due to which several complaints were received from all parts of the

country about the non-receipt of ballot papers(Refer Reference-8). This
(or page no. 59 of this petition)
confirms that the Postal addresses of the majority of voters are at stake.

11. It is humbly submitted that with regard to the **'Signature of the elector attested on the Declaration Paper which was sent to the Returning Officer along with the voted Ballot Paper'**- there is no mechanism or no specimen signatures of the electors are available with the Returning Officer to verify the signature of the elector attested on the Declaration Paper whether it is genuine or not. This is not limited to the voters of Andhra Pradesh only but also to all the voters all over India.

It is clearly evident that the first source i.e. Postal address has become futile in establishing the identity of the elector since all the Ballot Papers were already posted. But, still there is one option available for the Returning to establish a mechanism / procedure for verifying the correctness of the signature of the elector attested on the Declaration paper before the date of counting to comply the Rule 18(3) of IVC Rules 1985. Even then, neither the Returning Officer nor the Secretary, DAHDF has not taken any initiative towards establishing the procedure/mechanism just to protect the winning chances of one group of contestants.

12. It is humbly submitted that there is no accountability for the undelivered Ballot Paper covers either on the Returning Officer or on the Postal authorities since the ballot papers were sent under Certificate of Posting.

13. It is humbly submitted that as per the information received under RTI Act, the pattern of receipt of voted Ballot Papers by the Returning Officer at New Delhi was as follows :

*From 01.11.2009 to 25.11.2009 (25 days).....	602
*On 26.11.2009(single day)	980
*On 27.11.2009 (single day)	4,658
*On 28.11.2009(being a postal holiday).....	48
*On 29.11.2009 (being a public holiday).....	NIL
*On 30.11.2009(being the last day of polling)..	10,513
TOTAL	16,801

It is a fact that 96.13% Ballot Papers(i.e.16,151 ballot papers out of 16,801) received in the last 3 working days (on 26th,27th and 30th Nov,2009) only.

Out of 16,199 ballot papers received from 26.11.2009 to 30.11.2009, majority i.e. more than 95% were posted at New Delhi itself and all of them are suspected to be grabbed either from the Quarantine Station authorities or from Postal authorities, Kapashera and leading to the establishment of suspicion of rigging of election.

14. It is humbly submitted that here the modus operandi was that VCI prepared electoral roll and submitted to the Govt. of India and the Govt. of India appointed Returning Officer and Assistant Returning Officers to conduct the elections. The Returning Officer sent the ballot papers to the electors to their respective addresses under Certificate of Posting as mentioned in the

electoral roll. Since the postal addresses were not updated by the VCI in the electoral roll since years, most of the ballot papers were not delivered to the electors and were returned as undelivered post. Some of the contestants knew pretty well that there are no specimen signatures available with the Returning Officer to cross verify the correctness of signatures of electors and they managed the authorities at Quarantine Station, New Delhi and the authorities at Post Office, Kapashera, New Delhi in grabbing thousands of undelivered ballot papers. After grabbing the undelivered ballot papers, these contestants filled the declaration papers with the details available on the outer cover of the dispatched/undelivered Ballot Paper and simply attested some signature, which is not at all relevant or even coincide macroscopically with the original signature of the elector. Then they assembled in some Hotels in New Delhi and shared the votes among themselves (*i.e. every voter has to vote for 11 candidates. If a contestant grabs one Ballot Paper, he will share votes with another 10 candidates on a single Ballot Paper. Ultimately he gets 11 votes with a single Ballot Paper by sharing with other 10 candidates*), sealed the covers and posted in various post boxes in New Delhi and also sent through courier and speed-post service from New Delhi itself. All the information, *except signature of the elector*, required to fill the declaration paper (Form III) was available on the outer cover of the dispatched/undelivered ballot paper cover sent by the Returning Officer, which made their task easy to carry out the rigging of votes successfully.

15. It is humbly submitted that after coming to know about this fraud and modus operandi of such contestants, Association of Indian Zoo and Wildlife Veterinarians, Uttar Pradesh has submitted a representation on 01.12.2009 informing the discrepancies and malpractices raising the doubt about the correctness of the signatures of electors and rigging of votes at New Delhi (representation enclosed herewith as *Reference-11*). Specific representations dated 24.02.2010; 21.02.2010 & 25.02.2010 were submitted, by *Sri Ponnamp Prabhakar, MP, Lok Sabha, Sri M. Anjan Kumar Yadav, MP, Lok Sabha and myself along with Dr. Kuchewar A Sitaram respectively*, to the Returning Officer, the Secretary, DAHDF, Govt. of India and also to the Hon'ble Union Minister for Agriculture for implementation of Hon'ble High Court of A.P. orders and to establish a mechanism/procedure to verify the correctness of signatures of the electors attested on the Declaration papers before the date of counting of votes. But they are non-reactive to such specific representations and have not initiated any action to get the specimen signatures of the electors from any part of the country leading to a doubt regarding the honesty of the Returning Officer and the Secretary, DAHDF in conducting the elections in a fair manner. The representations of the M.P.s, Lok Sabha is enclosed herewith as *Reference-12*. The representation Dt. 25.2.2010 made by me is enclosed herewith as *Reference-13*.

16. It is humbly submitted that the entire process of conduct of elections will be construed to be held in a proper and fair manner, only, if the Returning Officer collects the specimen signatures of the electors from the respective

State Veterinary Councils of the country or any mechanism/procedure before the date of counting of votes to verify the correctness of signatures of the electors. It is submitted that it is the bound duty of the Returning Officer to comply with the Rule 18(1)(c), Rule 18(3) of IVC Rules 1985 for which he should verify the signature on Declaration Paper (Form III), if any objection raised by the contestants/ authorized representatives for confirming the correctness of the signature of the elector. *But after receiving the above representations, there was no positive initiation/action from the Returning Officer or from the Secretary, DAHDF to establish a mechanism/procedure to verify the correctness of signatures of the electors attested on the Declaration papers before the date of counting of votes.*

I am stating following Rules of IVC Rules, 1985 for ready reference (or refer Reference-10):

i) **Rule 16(8)** states that “Every elector desirous of recording his vote shall, after filling up the declaration paper(Form III) and the voting paper(Form II) according to the directions given in the letter intimation(Form IV),enclose the voting paper in the voting paper cover, stick up and enclose the said cover along with the declaration paper in the outer envelope addressed to the Returning Officer and send the outer envelope by post at the elector’s own cost or by hand to the Returning Officer, so as to reach him not later than the appointed time for closure of voting on the date fixed for the poll”

ii) **Rule 16(10)** states that “ On receipt by post or by hand of the envelope containing the declaration paper and the closed cover containing the voting paper the Returning Officer shall endorse on the outer envelope the date and hour of receipt”

iii) **Rule 18 (1)** states that “A voting paper cover shall be rejected by the Returning Officer if-

- (a) the outer envelope contains no declaration paper outside the voting paper cover ,or
- (b) the declaration paper is not the one sent by the Returning Officer,Or
- (c) the declaration paper is not signed by the elector, or
- (d) the voting paper is placed outside the voting paper cover, or
- (e) more than one declaration paper or voting paper cover have been enclosed in one and the same outer envelope.

iv) **Rule 18 (2)** states that “In each case of rejection the word ‘rejected’ shall be endorsed on the voting paper cover and the declaration paper. The reasons fro rejection shall also be recorded in brief, on voting paper cover”

v) **Rule 18 (3)** states that “After satisfying himself that the electors have affixed their signatures to the declaration papers, the Returning Officer shall keep all the declaration papers in safe custody pending disposal under Rule1”

vi) **Rule19 (1)** states that “on the date appointed for counting, the voting paper covers, other than those rejected under Rule 18,shall be opened and the voting papers taken out and mixed together”

17. In the circumstances stated above, I filed a writ petition on 08.11.2010 in W.P.27725/2010 in the Hon'ble High Court of A.P., explaining the modus operandi of the fraud, for an order or direction, declaring the inaction of the Returning Officer and Secretary, DAHDF in adopting the procedure contemplated under Rule 18(1) (c) and Rule 18 (3) of IVC Rules 1985 while scrutinizing the declaration paper for rejection of voting paper cover by verifying the signatures macroscopically attested on the declaration papers with the original specimen signatures of the respective electors by considering the representation dated 25.02.2010 made by me. The Hon'ble High Court of A.P. was pleased to pass orders Dt.19.11.2010 directing the Returning Officer that *"In terms of Rule 18 of Veterinary Council Rules, 1985 the signature contained on this Form III has got to be verified by the Returning Officer. For this purpose it is open to the Returning Officer-2nd respondent herein to obtain all such records, which are available with the Veterinary Council of India and also the respective Veterinary State Councils. It is also equally open to the 2nd respondent to secure all such information, which is necessary and appropriate by him through internet/web. However, the 2nd respondent shall not destroy the declaration papers in Form III filed by all the electors. It is open to the petitioner or for that matter any other elector to be present at the time of verification of the declaration paper contained in Form III at the time of counting of votes. Any objection raised by the new voter, shall be scrutinized and appropriately dealt with."* The order copy is enclosed herewith as *Reference-14*.

18. It is humbly submitted that I was present during the counting of votes i.e. on 26.11.2010 and I observed that thousands of Declaration Forms (Form-III), which were accompanied with Voting Paper Covers, from different states of the country, were containing similar kind of hand writings as if all filled by only few (12-20) individuals, which is quite unusual and also seems that most of them were attested with fake signatures of the electors. Then I raised few written objections about the correctness of signatures, but, the Returning Officer bluntly rejected my objections without any kind of verifications stating "*Rejected as specimen signature not produced*". It clearly shown that the Returning didn't collected a single specimen signature of the electors as per the option/direction given to him by the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. in W.P.No.27725/2010. I am herewith submitting documentary evidences for such objections proving the decisions of Returning Officer were wrong & biased. (documentary evidences are enclosed herewith as *Reference-15*.)

19. It is humbly submitted that in view of my observations during the counting process, under RTI Act-2005, I applied on 09.12.2010 for photocopies of the Declaration Forms (Form III) accompanied with all the voted Ballot Papers and for other specific information. But I didn't get the photocopies as per my request within the stipulated time. Then I applied to the Appellate authority under RTI Act on 11.03.2011. Even

then I didn't get copies within the stipulated time. After my continuous struggle and communication, I received a letter dated 03.06.2011 from the Appellate authority to receive photocopies personally on or after 30.06.2011 from Dr. Vijay Kumar, Asst. Returning Officer & Quarantine Officer, Quarantine Station, New Delhi. I received 17,166 photocopies from Dr. Vijay Kumar, Asst. Returning Officer cum Quarantine Officer, AQCS, New Delhi on 22.07.2011. As per his letter dated 21.07.2011, total Declaration Forms photocopied were 17,226, but he has handed-over me 17,166 copies only. Letter dated 21.07.2011 is enclosed herewith as *Reference-17*. The question penetrating here is, why he has not handed-over all the copies photocopied?

20. It is humbly submitted that I have gone through all the photocopies (i.e. 17,166) of the Declaration Forms and found that more than 50% Declaration Forms are attested with fake signatures of the electors confirming the contentions of my W.P. 27725/2010 in the Hon'ble High Court of A.P. Then, I segregated them into 27 Volumes logically i.e. basing on the hand writing style of the individuals on the Declaration Forms. *Each Volume contains photocopies of the Declaration Forms written by a single individual only irrespective of the place/State of the elector and >99% of them contain fake signatures*, which is quite unusual.

Sl. No.	VOLUME NUMBER	No.of PAGES	Belonging to the STATE(S)
1	Volume-I-A	226	DVC,UPVC,Kar.SVC & OVC
2	Volume-I-B	227 to 527	ASMVC,RVC,MSVC,WBVC,TNVC,KVC,MPVC,APVC,HNVC,BiharVC,HPVC,PbVC,GVC,MizVC,ManipurVC & VCI
3	Volume-II	310	DVC,HNVC,RVC,UPVC,PbVC,BiharVC,MSVC,MPVC,TNVC,OVC,KarVC,HPVC,GVC&VCI
4	Volume-III	193	UPVC,RVC,ASMVC,KarVC,OVC,PVC,DVC,ManipurVC,WBVC,MSVC & VCI
5	Volume-IV	278	HVC,RVC,UPVC,PbVC,HPVC,GVC,BiharVC,MSVC & VCI
6	Volume-V	141	KarVC,OVC & ASMVC
7	Volume-VI	100	RVC,GVC,HNVC,PbVC,MSVC
8	Volume-VII	59	PbVC,MSVC,BiharVC,OVC,VCI,GVC,DVC,KarVC,MPVC,TNVC,KVC,MeghVC,ASMVC,RVC,RVC,UPVC & WBVC
9	Volume-VIII	202	HNVC,DVC,MSVC,PbVC,KVC & VCI
10	Volume-IX	32	UPVC,KarVC,MSVC,MPVC,OVC,PbVC,KVC & VCI
11	Volume-X	45	MSVC,MPVC & WB
12	Volume-XI	86	RVC & WBVC
13	Volume-XII	39	RVC
14	Volume-XIII	14	RVC
15	Volume-XIV	10	RVC
16	Volume-XV	63	RVC
17	Volume-XVI	42	RVC
18	Volume-XVII	30	MSVC
19	Volume-XVIII	84	MSVC
20	Volume-XIX	48	MSVC
21	Volume-XX	46	MPVC
22	Volume-XXI	88	OVC
23	Volume-XXII	42	ASMVC
24	Volume-XXIII	64	WBVC
25	Volume-XXIV	25	WBVC
26	Volume-XXV	65	WBVC
27	Volume-XXVI	100	WBVC & TripuraVC
28	Volume-XXVII	17	MSVC & MPVC
TOTAL		2,750	

The above volumes i.e. Volume-I-A to Volume-XXVII are enclosed volume-wise herewith as *Reference-18*.

21. It is humbly submitted that if 2,750 Declaration Forms contains the hand writing of only 28 individuals and more than >99% of them contain

fake signatures, is there any sanctity for this election? In addition to these 2,750 Forms, there are few more thousands of Declaration Forms with fake signatures, which I couldn't submit due to the constraint of petition becoming abnormal in size. My contentions in W.P.No.27725/2010 are being established/ confirmed by analyzing the material evidences submitted herewith as Reference-18.

ROLE OF AUTHORITIES & CONTESTANTS IN THIS SCAM:

- (i). The authorities in the Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying & Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi are responsible for their intentional decisions/inactions just to complete the counting process by hook or crook, ignoring the specific representations/facts/contentions filed in the Court, in order to safeguard the winning chances of Dr.Narayan Mohanty group of candidates?
- (ii). The Quarantine authorities, AQCS, New Delhi misappropriated their powers by handing over few thousands of undelivered ballot paper covers to Dr.Narayan Mohanty group of contestants.
- (iii). The postal authorities at the Post Office, Kapashera, New Delhi sold dispatched/undelivered ballot paper covers to some contestants lead by Dr.Akhilesh Kamal.

(iv). Some contestants, irrespective of group, managed either the Quarantine authorities or the Postal authorities in grabbing/purchasing the dispatched/undelivered Ballot Papers?

All the above authorities & contestants made this VCI Election a scam and made travesty of our democratic system

Hence, I request the Honorable Central Vigilance Commissioner to enquire/investigate into the following:

(i). Inaction of the Secretary, Dept. of A.H.D.& F., Ministry of Agriculture on the representations dated 21.02.2010,24.02.2010 and 25.02.010 of Sri. M.Anjan Kumar Yadav, Honorable Parliament Member; Sri.Ponnam Prabhakar, Honorable Parliament member and Convenor,A.P.Congrress Lok Sabha & Rajya Sabha Members Forum and myself & Dr.A.S.kuchewar respectively for establishing a mechanism/procedure to verify the correctness of the signatures of the electors attested on the Declaration Papers before the date of counting. **(Refer References-12 & 13)** Date of counting was 26.11.2010.

(ii). Violation of Rule 16 (2) of IVC Rules,1985 in the case of re-election to A.P.(refer para-8 of this petition) by the Returning Officer.

(iii). On the day of counting, when I made few specific objections under Rule 18(1) (c) and Rule 18 (3) of IVC Rules 1985 about the

correctness of the signatures of electors, Returning Officer bluntly rejected my objections with a general statement that "*Rejected as specimen signature not produced*". I am herewith enclosing the documentary evidences for such objections proving the decisions of Returning Officer were wrong, biased and the violation of Rule 18(1) (c) and Rule 18 (3) of IVC Rules 1985.(Refer Reference-15).

(iv). Role of the Assistant Returning Officer cum Quarantine Officer in the scam needs to be investigated, since, entire election process, i.e. preparation of Ballot Papers, pasting of addresses of the electors on the ballot paper covers, sealing of Ballot Paper covers after filling with all prescribed papers, dispatching of Ballot Paper Covers to electors under certificate of posting, Receiving of voted Ballot Paper Covers and undelivered Ballot Paper Covers, maintenance of prescribed daily records of the election and counting of votes was done in the Quarantine Station(AQCS),Kapashera, New Delhi under his supervision.

(a).It is a fact that the receipt of undelivered Ballot Papers with Returning Officer were only 1,293 out of a total of 51,693 dispatched Ballot Papers at the end of 30.11.2009. When more than 50% addresses are wrong due to the non-updation of addresses in the electoral roll by VCI, this meager number of receipt of Undelivered Ballot Papers is indicating his role in this scam.

Further, I humbly submit that in the VCI Elections held in 2006, the count of undelivered Ballot Papers received by the Returning Officer was more than 15,000 with a dispatch of 46,500(approx.) Ballot Papers.

(b). As per the letter dated 21.07.2011 of ARO, total Declaration Forms photocopied were 17,226, but he has handed-over me 17,166 copies only. (Refer Reference-17) Why he has not handed-over all the copies photocopied?

(v). Counting of votes completed on 28.11.2010 but results were not declared till 01.03.2011 which is against to the Rule 20(1) and 20 (4) of Indian Veterinary Council Rules,1985(Refer Reference-10).. Why results were not declared on 28.11.2011? and what made them to publish notification on 01.03.2011?(refer Reference-16)

(vi).Postal authorities at Post Office, Kapashera, New Delhi needs to be interrogated for their role in selling the dispatched/undelivered Ballot Paper covers to some contestants.

(vii). How one individual ^{Dr. KULDEEP AHLAWAT - 1st declaration paper of his count vol-I-A)} was able to fill 527 Declaration Forms with fake signatures from 16 states of the country?(Refer Volume-I-A and Volume-I-B for evidence).

How hundreds of Declaration Forms contain same hand writing with fake signatures?(refer Volume-II to Volume-XXVII for evidence)?

In this regard all the members of VCI i.e. Dr.Akhilesh Kamal, Dr.Pradeep Lamba, Dr.Islamuiddin, Dr.Ingale Sandeep Vinayakrao, Dr.Amarjit Singh Makkar, Dr.Ravinder Chaudhary,Dr.Ravinder Kumar, Dr.Bhagwan Ashok Satale, Dr.R.Ramesh ,Dr.Bhawani Singh Rathore and Dr.Narayan Mohanty needs to be interrogated and investigated to confirm their role in grabbing/purchasing the dispatched/ undelivered Ballot Paper covers; filling & attesting the fake signatures of the electors on the Declaration Forms, staying/assembling in some Hotels/private places at New Delhi between 22.11.2009 and 30.11.2009 for sharing votes with other contestants and posting the voted Ballot Paper Covers by dropping in the Post Boxes/through Speed Post at different parts of New Delhi.

(viii). It is a fact that 96.13% Ballot Papers (i.e.16,151 ballot papers out of 16,801) received by the Returning Officer in the last 3 working days (on 26th,27th and 30th Nov,2009) only.(See Para-13 of this petition). Is such percentage is possible without rigging by some contestants?

Out of 16,199 ballot papers received from 26.11.2009 to 30.11.2009, majority i.e. more than 95% were posted at New Delhi itself. How it is possible that the votes of all States of the country were posted at New Delhi? Outer covers are secured and are available in Quarantine Station for verification & confirmation.

In view of the references (i.e. **References 1 to 18**) submitted herewith, it is observed that entire election process was corrupted by the then Returning Officer (Govt.of India official, Ministry of Agriculture, DAHDF, Krishi Bhavan); Assistant Returning Officer cum Quarantine Officer (Govt.of India Official,Ministry of Agriculture, DAHDF,AQCS, New Delhi); authorities at the Post Office, Kapashera, New Delhi and the elected members of Veterinary Council of India along with some more contestants who lost the election.

Hence, I humbly request the Honorable authority to conduct a thorough investigation and punish the culprits involved in the scam without any mercy to protect and to strengthen the democratic values of our system.

Thanking you Sir.

Your's faithfully,


(Dr.K.KRISHNA KUMAR)

e-mail ID: drkkindia@gmail.com

Mobile # +91 98498 08009

Encl: 1.References from 1 to 18.

2.Reference 18 contains 28 Volumes serially numbered from Volume-I-A & Volume-I-B and from Volume-II to Volume-XXVII in an ascending order containing 2,750 photocopies of Declaration Forms.

INDEX OF REFERENCES

Sl.No.	REFERENCE	PARTICULARS	Page No.
1	Reference-1	Election Notification dated 12 10 2009	25
2	Reference-2	i.Representation from A.P.Vet.Assn. dated 17.11.2009 ii. Representation from A.P.Vet.Assn. dated 17.11.2009	26 & 27 28
3	Reference-3	Order dt.29.12.2009 of Hon'ble High Court of A.P.in W.P.No.25775/2009	29 to 34
4	Reference-4	i.Order dt.15.02.2010 of Hon'ble High Court of A.P.in W.A.No.74/2010 ii.Order dt.15.02.2010 of Hon'ble High Court of A.P.in W.A.No.120/2010	35 to 37 38 & 39
5	Reference-5	Order dt.05.04.2010 of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP No. 8698/2010	40 & 41
6	Reference-6	Order dt.29.10.2010 of Hon'ble High Court of A.P.in CC.No.1087/2010	42 & 43
7	Reference-7	i. Representation of Karnataka Veterinary Association dated 18.11.2009 ii. Representation of Gujarat Veterinary Council dated 19.11.2009	44 45
8	Reference-8	Counter Affidavit filed by the Returning Officer & Secretary, DADE, GOI in W.P.No.25775/2009	46 to 60
9	Reference-9	Re-election Notification for A.P.dated 03.11.2010	61
10	Reference-10	Indian Veterinary Council Rules,1985	62 to 75
11	Reference-11	Representation of Assn.of Indian Zoo & Wildlife Veterinarians dt.01.12.2009	76
12	Reference-12	Representations of Hon'ble Parliament members dt.21.02.2010 and 24.02.2010	77 to 84
13	Reference-13	Representation of Dr.K.Krishna Kumar & Dr.A.S.Kuchewar dated 25.02.2010	85 to 90
14	Reference-14	Order dt.19.11.2010 of Hon'ble High Court of A.P.in W.P.No.27725/2010	91 & 92
15	Reference-15	Documentary evidences for the objections raised by Dr.K.Krishna Kumar raised on the day of counting	93 to 104
16	Reference-16	Notification dated 01.03.2011 of VCI elected members	105 & 106
17	Reference-17	Letter dated 21.07.2011 of Quarantine Officer(NR)	107
18	Reference-18	Volumes I-A & I-B and Volume-II to Volume-XXVII	28 books containing 2,750 pages

Confidential

Comp No. 05/12/Vig.7- /163848
Central Vigilance Commission

Satarkta Bhavan, GPO Complex,
Block-A, I.N.A., New Delhi,
Dated 01.02.2012

To

Dr. K Krishna Kumar
Plot # 179, SBI Colony,
Gandhinagar, Kavadiguda,
Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh

Sub: Complaint against the officials of D/o AHD&F.

Sir,

Your complaint dated 19.01.2012 has been duly examined in the Commission and having regard to the nature of the issues raised therein, the same has been forwarded to Shri Sanjeev Ranjan, CVO, Department of Animal Husbandry, Dairying and Fisheries, Room No.190-A, Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi for necessary action. As such, while no further report is required to be sent to the Commission, the authorities concerned are required to look into the matter and take such action as deemed fit.

Yours faithfully,



(Puran Singh)
Section Officer