



**CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL
PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI**

O.A. No./100/644/2021

This the 25th Day of March, 2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

**Hon'ble Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Mr. A.K. Bishnoi, Member (A)**

Vijay Rajmohan
Age about 49 years
S/o Sh. S. Rajmohan
R/o D-3, Tower-17, Type-5
Kidwai Nagar East
New Delhi-110023.

... Applicant

(By Advocate : Mrs. Rashmi Chopra)

Versus

1. Union of India represented
By Secretary
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions
Department of Personnel & Training
North Block, New Delhi-110001.
2. Union of India represented
By Secretary
Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare
Department of Agriculture, Cooperation and
Farmers Welfare
Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi-110001.
3. Central Vigilance Commissioner
Central Vigilance Commission
Satarkta Bhavan, Block-A
GPO Complex, INA
New Delhi-110023.
4. The Establishment Officer
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions
Department of Personnel & Training
North Block, New Delhi-110001.



5. Joint Secretary (AVD)
Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances & Pensions
Department of Personnel & Training
North Block, New Delhi-110001.
6. Chief Vigilance Officer
Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare
Department of Agriculture, Cooperation and
Farmers Welfare
Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi-110001.

... Respondents

(By Advocates : Mr. Y.P. Singh and Mr. Hanu Bhaskar)

O R D E R (ORAL)

Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman :

The applicant is working as Director (Trade) in the Ministry of Agriculture and Farmers Welfare. On account of pendency of a criminal case against him, he was not being issued the Vigilance Clearance and that, in turn, impacted his promotion. On 17.12.2018, the applicant made a representation to the respondents, stating that the CBI Court at Chennai acquitted him in CC No. 3/2018, vide its judgment dated 13.12.2018, and requested the respondents to take the same into account and do the needful. This was followed by various representations, the latest one being dated 11.03.2021. The grievance of the applicant is that no action has been taken thereon so far.

Item No. 5



2. Today, we heard Mrs. Rashmi Chopra, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. Y.P. Singh & Shri Hanu Bhaskar, learned counsel for respondents.

3. Obviously because a criminal case was pending against the applicant, certain benefits could not be extended to him. The applicant has enclosed a copy of the judgment dated 13.12.2018, rendered by the Trial Court, through which he was acquitted in the criminal case. That needs to be taken into account by the respondents and if any benefit was denied to him on account of the pendency of the criminal case, the same needs to be extended to him.

4. We, therefore, dispose of the O.A., directing the respondents No.1 to 3 to pass orders on the representation dated 11.03.2021 submitted by the applicant, within a period of three weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

There shall be no order as to costs.

(A.K. Bishnoi)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

March 25, 2021
/lg/jyoti/mbt/akshaya/