

sbw

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO.9071 OF 2014

D. Muthuraj	... Petitioner
vs.	
Central Vigilance Commission & Ors.	...Respondents

Mr. Nikhilesh Pote for the petitioner.
Mr. Parag Vyas a/w Y. R. Mishra for the respondent no.1.
Mr. D. P. Singh for the respondent nos.2 and 3.

**CORAM : A.S.OKA, &
A. K. MENON, JJ.**

DATE : 20th APRIL, 2017

P.C.

1. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner does not dispute that the first complaint dated 20th July, 2012 has been dealt with by the first respondent and the necessary action has been initiated. However, his grievance is about the second complaint which is dated 14th September, 2013. He invited our attention to the said complaint. He submitted that the complaint seeks action against Shri Naresh Kumar and Dr. S. Guruprasad. He submitted that as far as Shri Naresh Kumar is concerned, the Office Memorandum dated 28th April, 2015 shows that the action has been initiated on the basis of the complaint filed by the petitioner. But there is no action taken as regards Dr. Guruprasad.

2. The learned counsel for the respondent no.2 has tendered across the bar a copy of the print out of the e-mail issued by the Deputy Director DOP/Per-Legal/DRDO Head Quarters in which it is stated that the disciplinary proceedings under Rule 16 of CCS (CCA) Rules 1965 have been initiated against Dr. Guruprasad and the charge memorandum dated 30th September, 2016 has been served upon him. It is further stated that Dr. Guruprasad has filed a reply which is under examination. Therefore, we find that even the second complaint has been acted upon. Hence, at this stage, it is not necessary to issue any further directions in this petition.
3. Hence, the petition is disposed of.

(A. K. MENON, J.)

(A. S. OKA, J.)