



\$~43

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(C) 4152/2026, CM APPL. 20296/2026, CM APPL. 20297/2026, CM APPL. 20298/2026**
UNION OF INDIA & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr Premtosh K Mishra CGSC,
Mr Shrey Sharma, Mr Anubhav
Upadhyay, Mr Arpit Bamal,
Advs.

versus

RANDHIR KUMAR SINHARespondent
Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

% **ORDER**
01.04.2026

1. Through the present Writ Petition, *inter alia*, the Petitioners have challenged the correctness of order dated 20.11.2025 (hereafter '**impugned order**'), passed by the learned Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench, New Delhi in O.A. No. 2427/2024.
2. The Respondent was working with Petitioner No. 1 for a period of over three decades. Admittedly, there has been no complaint in relation to the Respondent's services. Even, no Show Cause Notice has been issued to him during all these years. The Respondent applied for senior level position, namely, Director (Operations) and also Chairman and Managing Director in Defence Public Sector Undertakings. The Respondent's promotion was withheld on account of vigilance clearance.



3. The Respondent was denied vigilance clearance on the basis of a criminal case instituted against him and his family members by his cousin in regard to a property dispute. Undisputedly, the aforesaid criminal case has no connection whatsoever with the performance of duties of the Respondent. Even in that case, the cognizance taken by the learned Trial Court was stayed by the High Court of Patna. Aggrieved by the denial of vigilance clearance, the Respondent preferred the subject original application.

4. By the impugned order, after appraising the facts of the case, the learned Tribunal has rightly formed the opinion that the Respondent, who has had an unblemished career for about 38 years, could not be indefinitely denied vigilance clearance on account of pendency of a criminal case between the cousins.

5. Pertinently, in the criminal case, the Police after investigation submitted closure report. The trial Court however took cognizance, which has been stayed by the High Court.

6. Keeping in view the aforesaid facts, this Court does not find it appropriate to exercise extraordinary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

7. The petition is dismissed. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

APRIL 1, 2026

“SK”