



\$~69

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 17007/2024 & CM APPL. 72088-72089/2024

JASMEET SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Samdarshi Sanjay, Ms. Monika Sharma, Mr. Ashish Sharma and Ms. Apoorva Pal, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Avni Singh, Advocate for R-1.
Ms. Malvi Balyan, Advocate for
Ms. Sangeeta Bharti, SC DJB.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

09.12.2024

1. The petitioner has filed this writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, for the following reliefs:

“(i) Pass a writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ and/or directing the Respondent No.2&3 to take necessary action against Respondent 4&5 in terms of letter dated 15.11.2023 of CVC, New Delhi as informed through reply to RTI dated: 21.02.24.

(ii) Pass directions and/or appropriate writ to Respondent No.2 & 3 to place on record the inquiry, if any, conducted against delinquent officers, Respondent Nos. 4 &5 pursuant to the after the letter dated 15.11.2023 of CVC, as informed through reply to RTI which was sent to Chief Vigilance Officer, Delhi Jal Board.

(iii) Pass any such other and further orders and /or directions as this Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper in facts and circumstances of the present case.”

2. The petitioner made a complaint to the Central Vigilance Commission [“CVC”] on 07.10.2023, with regard to alleged inaction by



the concerned officers of the respondent No. 2 – Delhi Jal Board [“DJB”] in respect of use of illegal borewell at *R-3, R-4, & R-5, Masjid Road, Jangpura, Bhogal, New Delhi – 110014*. His contention, based upon information supplied by the CVC under the Right to Information Act, 2005 [Annexure A-2 to the writ petition], is that the complaint was forwarded by the CVC to the Chief Vigilance Officer, DJB [“CVO”] on 15.11.2023. According to the petitioner, CVO has not taken any further action in this regard.

3. Ms. Malvi Balyan, learned counsel for DJB, who appears on advance notice, states that a decision will be taken in this regard within the next eight weeks, and will also be communicated to the petitioner.

4. The petition, alongwith the pending applications, is disposed of in these terms.

5. It is made clear that this Court has not made any comment on the merits of the matter, and this order is not intended to prejudice any officer against whom the petitioner’s allegations are directed. The CVO is free to take a decision in accordance with law.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

DECEMBER 9, 2024
SS/JM/