



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**C.W.P. No. 18225 of 2025
Date of decision: 07.07.2025**

Vishal Bhardwaj**.... Petitioner**

Vs.

The Union of India and others**.... Respondents****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI**

Present: Mr. Satyawan Singh Nain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Premjit Singh Hundal, Senior Panel Counsel
for Union of India.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J (Oral)

1. Through the instant writ petition, cast under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, a prayer is made for issuance of a direction upon respondent No.3-The Central Vigilance Commission, to decide/take action upon petitioner's representations dated 21.09.2024, 28.01.2025, 30.04.2025 and 28.05.2025 (Annexures P-5 to P-8), respectively.

2. This is the third round of litigation. The petitioner had earlier approached this Court by way of filing CWP No.2457 of 2024, which was dismissed as withdrawn with liberty to the petitioner to approach Central Administrative Tribunal, since the petitioner was an employee of Bharat Sanchar Nigam Limited (BSNL). Accordingly, the petitioner preferred petition before the Central Administrative Tribunal, Chandigarh Bench, Chandigarh, which was not accepted being not maintainable, as the same was beyond the subject jurisdiction of the Tribunal (supra). This has caused the grievance to the petitioner, propelling him to file the CWP-14599 of 2024, which was dismissed as withdrawn, vide order dated 01.07.2024, with the observations that the petitioner has the remedy to approach different Government agencies like CBI, CVC, Lokayukt etc. That order was



contested by the petitioner by filing intra-court appeal through LPA No.1921 of 2024. However, that appeal was also dismissed vide order dated 14.08.2024.

3. After losing the battle, the petitioner then approached the Central Vigilance Commission, by filing a detailed complaint on dated 24.09.2024. The complaint was entertained and now vide order dated 02.01.2025 (Annexure P-9), the petitioner was called upon to confirm the veracity of the complaint, as filed by him.

4. Instead of approaching the Vigilance Department, CGMT, Haryana, Ambala, the petitioner has again approached this Court, by filing the instant petition, on the similar prayer which was preferred earlier.

5. This Court has considered the submissions, as made by learned counsel for the petitioner and is of the considered opinion that the instant petition, in fact, is a misconceived and a pre-mature motion. The detailed complaint preferred before the competent authority concerned, is still under consideration and the petitioner was invited by the authority concerned, to confirm the contents of the complaint and substantiate the charges levelled therein. Instead of approaching the competent authority concerned, in pursuance to Annexure P-9, the petitioner has again filed the instant petition.

6. Though, this Court is of the considered opinion that the instant petition deserves to be dismissed with heavy costs, however, taking a lenient view by observing a caution against the petitioner, the instant petition is simply **dismissed** being pre-mature, at this stage.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

07.07.2025

deepak

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No