

No.000/VGL/70
Government of India
Central Vigilance Commission

Satarkata Bhavan, Block "A",
GPO Complex, I.N.A.,
New Delhi - 110 023.
Dated 25th September 2000

**Subject: - Suspension of public servants involved in criminal/
departmental proceedings.**

Suspension is an effective tool for checking corruption. There have been many instances where senior officials, who had been trapped or were alleged to have disproportionate wealth or who were facing charge sheets on other serious charges, had not been suspended. It has also come to notice that officers charged of corruption, if not suspended, manage to get their inquiries delayed because delay in criminal/departmental proceedings enables them to continue in service even though the charges against them are grave enough to deserve the punishment of dismissal from service. Such officials can also use the opportunity of continuance in service for earning money through illegal/corrupt means. The Commission, therefore, is of the view that officers facing criminal/ departmental proceedings on serious charges of corruption should be placed under suspension as early as possible and their suspension should not be revoked in a routine manner.

2. It has been provided in para 2.4, Chapter V of the Vigilance Manual, Volume-I, that public interest should be the guiding factor in deciding whether, or not, a public servant should be placed under suspension; or whether such action should be taken even while the matter is under investigation and before a prima-facie case has been established. The instructions provide that it would be appropriate to place a person under suspension if: -

- (i) the continuance of the public servant in office is likely to prejudice investigation, trial or inquiry [apprehending tampering with documents or witness]; or
- (ii) where the continuance in office of the public servant is likely to seriously subvert discipline in the office in which he is working;
- (iii) where the continuance in office of the public servant will be against the wider public interest, e.g., if there is a public scandal and it is considered necessary to place the public servant under suspension to demonstrate the policy of the Government to deal strictly with officers involved in such scandals, particularly corruption;

- (iv) where the investigation has revealed a prima-facie case justifying criminal/departmental proceedings which are likely to lead to his conviction and/or dismissal, removal or compulsory retirement from service; or
- (v) where the public servant is suspected to have engaged himself in activities prejudicial to the interest of the security of the State.

3. Para 2.5, Chapter V of the Vigilance Manual, Volume-I also lays down that it may be considered desirable to suspend a public servant for misdemeanor of the following types: -

- (i) an offence or conduct involving moral turpitude;
- (ii) corruption, embezzlement or misappropriation of Government money, possession of disproportionate assets, misuse of official powers for personal gains;
- (iii) serious negligence and dereliction of duty resulting in considerable loss to Government;
- (iv) desertion of duty; and
- (v) refusal or deliberate failure to carry out written orders of superior officers.

[In case of types (iii), (iv) and (v) discretion should be exercised with care].

4. It has also been provided in para 17 of the "Directive on investigation of cases by the Special Police Establishment Division of the CBI" that the CBI would recommend suspension of the concerned employees in appropriate cases.

5. The Central Vigilance Commission has been empowered, vide para 3 (v) of the Government of India's Resolution No.371/20/99-AVD.III dated 4th April 1999, to exercise superintendence over the vigilance administration of various Ministries of the Central Government or Corporations established by or under any Central Act, Government Companies, Societies and local authorities, owned or controlled by that Government. Since the suspension of a public servant on serious charges, like corruption, is directly related to the vigilance administration, the Commission hereby desires that all disciplinary authorities should follow the instructions enumerated in paras 2, 3 and 4 supra strictly. It also desires that if the CBI recommends suspension of a public servant and the competent authority does not propose to accept the CBI's recommendation in that regard, it may be treated as a case of difference of opinion between the CBI and the administrative authority and the matter may be referred to the Commission for its advice. It also directs that if a

person had been suspended on the recommendations of the CBI, the CBI may be consulted if the administrative authority proposes to revoke the suspension order.

6. These instructions are available on the CVC's web-site <http://cvc.nic.in>



(N. VITTAL) 25.9.2000
CENTRAL VIGILANCE COMMISSIONER

To

1. The Secretaries of all Ministries/Departments of Government of India.
2. The Chief Secretaries to All Union Territories.
3. The Comptroller & Auditor General of India.
4. The Chairman, Union Public Service Commission.
5. The Chief Executives of All PSEs/Public Sector Banks/ Insurance Companies/Autonomous Organisations/ Societies.
6. The Chief Vigilance Officers in the Ministries/ Departments/PSEs/Public Sector Banks/Insurance Companies/Autonomous Organisations/Societies.
7. President's Secretariat/Vice-President's Secretariat/Lok Sabha Secretariat/Rajya Sabha Secretariat/PMO.
8. Director, CBI.
9. Department of Personnel & Training, North Block, New Delhi.