



\$~24

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 13211/2022**

GAVINOLLA SRINIVAS

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Akshay Mann, Mr Akshay
Khairwal, Mr. Mahendra Singh,
Advocates

versus

UNION OF INDIA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajesh Gogna, Counsel for UOI
with Ms Hibu B Monio , Ms Priya
Singh GP, Ms Rebina Rai, Ms Punita
Jha and Mr Shivam Tiwari Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

% **21.04.2026**

1. The petition is for the following reliefs:

a) Issue writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ/ direction/order setting aside the impugned order vide file No. 104/52/2022-AVD-IA dated 2.3.2022 as illegal, arbitrary and violative of Article 14, 21 and contrary to the judgment passed by the Hon''ble Supreme Court in Vineet Narain Vs Union of India, (1998) 1 SCC 226, subsequently direct the Respondent to take action on the Grievance No. DOPAT/E/ 2022/01408 dated 28.1.2022 according to the judgment passed by the Hon''ble Supreme Court in Vineet Narain Vs Union of India, (1998) SCC 226 & the direction D.O.No. 11017/04/2010-AIS-III dated 3.3.2010 issued by the Cabinet Secretary of Union of India,



b) Direct the Respondent to grant sanction for prosecution on the serious allegations of corrupt practices of Senior IAS Officer of Telangana state raised in the Grievance No. DOPAT/E/ 2022/01408 dated 28.1.2022 by the Petitioner.

c) Pass such other and further orders, as this Hon''ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.

2. The facts of the case would indicate that the petitioner had lodged a grievance dated 28.01.2022 before the Department of Personnel and Training (**hereinafter "DoPT"**) alleging serious acts of corruption and misconduct against a senior officer of the Indian Administrative Service (**hereinafter "IAS"**) of Telangana cadre.

3. The complaint was premised on material available in the public domain, including investigative reports, alleging that a private infrastructure company executing major irrigation projects in the State had *borne* expenses relating to a private family function of the said officer. It was further alleged that the executives of the said company were directly involved in coordinating arrangements and payments through certain entities.

4. The respondent–DoPT *vide* communication dated 02.03.2022 forwarded the complaint to the Chief Secretary, Government of Telangana for necessary action. It is the case of the petitioner that in view of the seniority of the officer concerned and the nature of allegations, the respondent– DoPT, being the competent authority, was required to take an appropriate decision, including on the aspect of sanction for prosecution, within a reasonable time in terms of applicable rules and the law laid down by the Supreme Court.

5. The principal grievance of the petitioner is that the complaint dated



28.01.2022, despite disclosing serious allegations supported by material, has not been considered and taken to its logical conclusion by the respondent-DoPT. It is his case that the respondent merely forwarded the complaint to the State Government without taking any independent decision as required in law. Learned counsel submits that though the matter was stated to have been taken up for preliminary enquiry by the Government of Telangana and an assurance was indicated that the same would be concluded within three-four weeks, no final outcome has been communicated till date.

6. Having considered the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and upon perusal of the material placed on record, this Court finds that the respondent- DoPT has to take a final view on the complaint made by the petitioner with due expedition. Mere forwarding of the complaint to the State Government cannot absolve the respondent of its obligation, particularly where the matter has remained pending for a considerable period. If the report from the concerned government has not been received despite lapse of sufficient time the respondent – DoPT is not denuded from its power to deal with such an eventuality and to take appropriate action.

7. In any case, the respondent- DoPT/concerned Ministry to decide the complaint in accordance with rules and regulations within a period of three months from the date of receipt of the copy of the order passed today.

8. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of.

PURUSHAINDR KUMAR KAURAV, J

APRIL 21, 2026

Tr/ss