

Item No.4



**Central Administrative Tribunal
Principal Bench, New Delhi**

O.A. No.738/2021

This the 2nd day of July, 2021

(Through Video Conferencing)

**Hon'ble Mr. Justice L. Narasimha Reddy, Chairman
Hon'ble Ms. Aradhana Johri, Member (A)**

Vinod Kumar Sandlesh
Joint Director
Central Translation Bureau
Department of Official Language
Ministry of Home Affairs
AntoyodayaBhawan, B Block, 8th Floor,
CGO Complex, Lodhi Road,
New Delhi - 110003

... Applicant

(By Advocate : Mr. Balaji Subramanian)

Versus

1. Union of India
Through the Secretary (OL)
Department of Official Language
Ministry of Home Affairs
NDCC-II Building,
Jai Singh Road, New Delhi – 110001
2. Chief Vigilance Officer
Department of Official Language
Ministry of Home Affairs
NDCC-II Building,
Jai Singh Road, New Delhi – 110001
3. Union Public Service Commission
Through the Secretary,
Dholpur House
Shah Jahan Road, New Delhi - 110069

... Respondents

(By Advocates : Ms. AnupamaBansal)

Item No.4

ORDER (Oral)



Justice L. Narasimha Reddy:

The applicant is now working as Joint Director in Central Translation Bureau (CTB). The next promotion is to the post of Director. CTB referred the matter in this behalf, to the UPSC. The applicant is stated to be very high in the seniority, for promotion to the post of Director. On being required by the UPSC, the department approached the DOP&T, in the context of issuance of vigilance clearance to the applicant.

2. The grievance of the applicant is that the vigilance clearance is being withheld and on account of that, there is every likelihood that he may not be selected for the post. In that background, he filed the OA with a prayer to direct the respondents 1 and 2 to give vigilance clearance to him for the purpose of promotion and to consider his application dated 02.07.2009.

3. This OA was listed earlier and it was directed that the learned counsel for the respondents shall obtain instructions. Today, it is stated that the vigilance clearance is withheld on account of the pendency of the inquiry against the applicant.

4. We heard Mr. Balaji Subramanian, learned counsel for the applicant and Ms. Anupama Bansal, learned counsel for the respondents, at the stage of admission.

5. The name of the applicant was forwarded to the UPSC to be considered for promotion to the post of Director. In the case of promotion, the vigilance clearance is essential, even for a selected candidate. The grievance of the applicant is that the vigilance clearance is withheld. As of now, we are not

Item No.4



aware of the correspondence that ensued between the various departments in this behalf. We are of the view that the applicant can be given a reply as to the status of his vigilance clearance.

6. We, therefore, dispose of the OA, directing the first respondent to inform the applicant through a communication about the status of the vigilance clearance, within one week from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Aradhana Johri)
Member (A)

(Justice L. Narasimha Reddy)
Chairman

sunita/lg/ns/akshaya/sd