



\$~21

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

+ **W.P.(C) 84/2026, CM APPL. 440-442/2026**

R. RAJENDRAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Avneesh Arputham and
Mr. Ankit Sharma, Advocates.

versus

INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajiv Shukla, Advocate.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

06.01.2026

%

1. This petition is directed against order dated 14th May, 2025 dismissing the Petitioner's appeal and upholding the penalty of censure imposed on him by the concerned Disciplinary Authority on 2nd August, 2024.

2. The background relevant to the present petition is as follows: The Petitioner is Grade 'H' Officer with the Respondent/Indian Oil Corporation Limited.¹ He joined the organisation in the year 1990 and has rendered service for over 35 years. It is his case that he has an unblemished service record and has consistently received 'Outstanding' ratings in the last 5 years, being the highest rating awarded under the applicable system. In 2019, the Petitioner was posted as General Manager (LPG Operations) at the Tamil Nadu State Office, tasked with overseeing LPG operations across the State. During this period, a contractor, Sri Ragavendra Cylinders, had been issued

¹ "IOCL"



a Letter of Intent in 2016 for statutory testing and painting works at the Madurai LPG Bottling Plant. The work did not commence. The Letter of Intent was therefore cancelled and the security deposit forfeited. On 16th October, 2020, a proposal was also initiated for holiday listing of the said contractor. The Petitioner, however, recommended that holiday listing should not be perused at that stage, as it could adversely affect IOCL's operations, and suggested that the contractor be called upon to explain and resume work, whereafter the proposal could be reconsidered. The proposal was later dropped at the plant level. No work order followed, no work was executed, and no payment was released.

3. Nonetheless, disciplinary proceedings were initiated against the Petitioner in relation to the recommendations made by him, and a charge-sheet dated 16th April, 2024 was issued. Upon consideration of the Petitioner's response thereto, the Disciplinary Authority, by order dated 2nd August, 2024, imposed the penalty of censure. Aggrieved, the Petitioner preferred an appeal seeking reversal of the said penalty; however, the same was rejected by the Appellate Authority by inter-office memorandum dated 14th May, 2025.

4. The Petitioner had approached this Court seeking setting aside of the impugned orders and also applied for consideration of his case for promotion to the post of Grade-I employee.

5. During the hearing, counsel for the Petitioner, on instructions, limits his relief to seeking a direction for consideration of his candidature for promotion from 'Grade-H' to 'Grade-I'. On this relief, it is submitted that the Petitioner became eligible for promotion in January, 2025, has secured 'Outstanding' ratings for the past five years, and has several professional



achievements to his credit, yet his candidature has not been considered. It is further urged that the Petitioner had submitted the requisite documents on 1st November, 2025, but no response has been received from IOCL till date. The apprehension is that the Petitioner's case for promotion is not being considered solely on account of the earlier penalty of censure imposed on him under a charge-sheet dated 16th April, 2024.

6. Counsel for IOCL, on instructions, states that the censure is not the basis for non-consideration of the Petitioner's promotion and does not, by itself, impede consideration of his candidature. It is further stated that if the Petitioner submits a representation raising his grievance on non-consideration of promotion, IOCL will examine it and respond within a fixed time.

7. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of with the following directions:

7.1. The Petitioner's communication dated 1st November, 2025 as well as the instant writ petition shall be treated as a representation to the IOCL. If any further information is required, IOCL shall intimate the same to the Petitioner within three working days of receipt of this order.

7.2. If the Petitioner wishes to submit a fresh or consolidated representation, he may do so within three working days of this order.

7.3. IOCL shall consider the representation and pass a reasoned order within ten working days of receipt of the representation, or within ten working days of receipt of any additional information sought under Paragraph 7.1, whichever is later. The decision shall be communicated to the Petitioner forthwith.

8. All rights and contentions are kept open. If the Petitioner remains aggrieved after the decision on the representation, he shall be at liberty to



pursue such remedy as may be available in law.

9. With the above directions, the petition is disposed of along with pending applications.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

JANUARY 6, 2026

nk