

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Appeal No. 562 of 2015**

Anil Tuteja S/o Late H. L. Tuteja, Aged About 52 Years Joint Secretary,
Govt. Of Chhattisgarh (I. A. S.), R/o Civil Lines, Raipur, District Raipur.
Civil & Revenue District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

----Appellant**Versus**

1. Union Of India Through The Secretary, Ministry Of Personnel & Training, North Block, New Delhi.
2. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through The Secretary, General Administration Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralay, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
3. The Principal Secretary, Department Of Law & Legislative Affairs, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralay, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
4. The Additional Chief Secretary, Department Of Food & Civil Supplies, Govt. Of Chhattisgarh, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralay, Naya Raipur, District Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
5. Chairman, Food Corporation Of India, Bara Khamba Lane, New Delhi.
6. Chhattisgarh State Civil Supplies Corporation Limited, Through Its Managing Director, Hitvada Bhawan, Avanti Vihar Colony, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

-----Respondents

For Appellant:	Shri BP. Sharma along with Shri Vivek Chopra, Advocate.
For Respondents No.1/Union of India:	Shri NK Vyas, Assistant Solicitor General.
For Respondents/State:	Shri JK. Gilda, Advocate General along with Shri Raj Kumar Gupta, Deputy Advocate General.
For Respondent No.5:	Shri BP. Gupta, Advocate.

Hon'ble The Chief Justice
Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy

Judgment on Board**Per Navin Sinha, Chief Justice****01/03/2016**

1. Learned Counsel for the Appellant submits that he seeks a limited

relief for consideration of his representation by the Union of India before deciding on the issue for grant of sanction under Section 19 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

2. Learned Counsel for the Union of India and the Advocate General submit that sanction is a purely administrative act and issues are clearly pre-mature as observed by the Learned Single Judge.

3. In the very limited nature of relief now sought, the question for maintainability of the appeal is left open for consideration in an appropriate case.

4. Sanction being purely in the domain of the administrator no directions can be issued to exercise it in a particular manner. It is for the administrator to consider matters in its wisdom in accordance with law. Nothing in this order can be construed as any opinion or observation on merits.

5. The appeal is disposed.

Sd/-
(Navin Sinha)
CHIEF JUSTICE

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
JUDGE