

## **Mahadeo P. Rout and Another Vs State of Maharashtra and Others**

**Court:** Bombay High Court

**Date of Decision:** Feb. 22, 2005

**Acts Referred:** Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 " Section 22, 22(3)  
 Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (CrPC) " Section 154

**Citation:** (2005) 3 BomCR 53

**Hon'ble Judges:** Gokhale H.L., J; Dharmadhikari S.C., J

**Bench:** Division Bench

**Advocate:** Subhash Jha, Jimesh Shah, Dinesh Tiwari, G. Agarwal, Geeta Hatkar and Anil Jadhav, for the Appellant; V.A. Thorat and R.M. Sawant for respondent No. 1, Ghulam Vahanvati, S.G. and Rodrigues, B.V. Phadnis and Masurkar for respondent No. 4, B.A. Desai, A.S.G. and S.S. Pakale, for respondent No. 3, C.J. Sawant and K.R. Belosay for respondent Nos. 5, 7 and 9 K.K. Singhvi, instructed by R.S. Datar, for respondent No. 6, S.C. Naidu, instructed by C.R. Naidu and Co. and Y.S. Jahagirdar, for the Respondent

**Final Decision:** Dismissed

### **Judgement**

Gokhale H.L., J.

The petitioners herein claim to be the Chairman and Secretary of one Shetkari Hitvardhak Sanstha. They have filed this petition based on some information received from respondent No. 10 herein concerning the decision of the Departmental Promotion Committee

(for short "DPC") promoting Certain Officers from the State Civil Service to Indian Administrative Service. The petition makes a grievance on the

basis of that information that those selections were tainted and a writ of mandamus is sought directing the preliminary enquiry by respondent No. 2

Central Bureau of Investigation ("C.B.I.") with respect to the selection made by DPC of 2003. Prayer (b) of this petition is that in case the enquiry

discloses commission of cognizable offence, the necessary investigation be again entrusted to respondent No. 2 and be monitored by this Court.

2. In this petition, respondent No. 1 is the State of Maharashtra, respondent No. 2 is C.B.I., respondent No. 3 is Union of India, respondent No,

4 is Union Public Service Commission and respondent Nos. 5 to 11 (except respondent N. 10 ) are the various officers who were involved in the

process of this DPC. Respondent No. 10, as stated above, is the officer, who was not selected in that DPC.

3. Inasmuch as the petition is filed on the basis of the information received from respondent No. 10, it will be advisable to refer to Original

Application No. 683 of 2004 which he has filed in the Central Administrative Tribunal making grievance about his non-selection. This original

application has been filed on 9th September, 2004. In this original application, he has challenged the notification dated 29th March, 2004 wherein

one P.E. Gaikwad and 11 others were appointed to the Indian Administrative Service on probation with immediate effect. The original application

refers to a conversation of respondent No. 10 on telephone with one N. Rama Rao, who has been joined as respondent No. 6 to this writ petition.

This conversation, according to respondent No. 10, records a sorry state of affairs. In that conversation, this Mr. Rama Rao is reported to have

stated that good amount has been paid to the then Chairman of the Selection Committee and two officers whose names are mentioned in para 4.17

of the original application, were stated to have been packed by the lobby which was working to get the IAS nominations.

4 Respondent Nos. 4, 5, 6 and 8 have filed their replies opposing this petition. Respondent No. 10 has filed his affidavit as well.

The respondents to this petition (other than respondent No. 10) have raised preliminary objection to the maintainability of the petition, firstly,

contending that the petitioners have no locus standi in the matter. Besides, if they are concerned in view of the information received by them, the

proper course for them is to lodge a complaint with the appropriate police Authorities of the State and matters are not to be lightly referred to

C.B.I. Secondly, it is contended that essentially it is service matter which respondent No. 10 has already filed to the Central Administrative

Tribunal and in such service matters, the Court is not expected to interfere at the instance of another party which tries to convert it into a Publish

Interest Litigation.

5. Mr. Jha, learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners, submitted that as far as locus standi of the petitioners is concerned, the doctrine of locus

standi is foreign to criminal jurisprudence. He has relied upon the observation of the Apex Court in para-5 in the case of Manohar Lal Vs. Vinesh

Anand and Others, . He submitted that whatever may be the individual grievance of respondent No. 10, the petitioners are also concerned with

clean administration and, therefore, this petition has been filed. He further submitted that where the Executive fails to discharge its responsibility,

judiciary must step in and provide a solution. In this behalf, he relied upon a judgment of the Apex Court in the case of Vineet Narain and Others

Vs. Union of India (UOI) and Another, . Lastly, he relied upon a judgment in the case of R.S. Raghunath Vs. State of Karnataka and another, and

particularly, the observations in para-31 thereof, to submit that when a case is made out disclosing a cognizable offence, the concerned officer has

to register the case. In the present case, since the high officers are involved, the petitioners do not expect an appropriate action from the

subordinate police officers and, therefore, a writ of mandamus is sought to the C.B.I. to do the needful.

6. As against these submissions of Mr. Zha, it was pointed by the respondents that as laid down by the Apex Court in the case of All India Institute

of Medical Sciences Employees" Union (Regd.) through its President Vs. Union of India (UOI) and Others, , the proper course for any aggrieved

party is to lodge a complaint with the appropriate Police Authorities u/s 154 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and complainant is not expected to

approach the High Court by filing a writ petition and to seek a direction that C.B.I. should enter the investigation. The said decision has been

followed by the Apex Court in the case of Gangadhar Janardan Mhatre Vs. State of Maharashtra and Others, . It was, therefore, submitted that

the proper remedy to the petitioners is to approach the Police Authorities of the State. Mr. Vahanvati, learned Solicitor General of India, appearing

for respondent No. 4-UPSC, pointed out that the question as to whether the High Court can refer the matter for investigation to C.B.I. without the

consent of the State Government, has been referred by the Apex Court to Larger Bench. This is reflected in para-14 of the judgment in the case of

Central Bureau of Investigation Vs. State of Rajasthan and Another, . He submitted that this judgment also accepts that, it may be that in some

appropriate cases such a reference could be directed by the High Court and Mr. Vahanvati submitted that the same could be so, pending the

determination by the Larger Bench. He however emphasized that the Apex Court has clearly stated in that very judgment that these powers are to

be invoked sparingly.

7. Mr. Singhvi, learned Counsel appearing for respondent No. 6, drew our attention to the affidavit filed by respondent No. 6 in this very matter

and pointed out that he has disputed this conversation which is relied upon by respondent No. 10. In para-5 of his affidavit he has stated as follows

:-

With reference to para 2 of the petition, I deny that the respondent No. 10 did tape recording of the conversation with me and B.D. Shinde as

alleged. I say that I have no occasion to hear and pursue the alleged tape and as far as my knowledge goes, I have not held any such conversation

with the respondent No. 10.

Independent of that submission, Mr. Singhvi has also supported the submissions of the learned Solicitor General and referred to a judgment

recently rendered by the Apex Court in the case of Secretary, Minor Irrigation and Rural Engineering Services, U.P. and Others Vs. Sahngoo

Ram Arya and Another, . In para-6 of that judgment, the Apex Court has commented that the High Court in that matter had proceeded to direct

an inquiry by C.B.I. on the basis of ""ifs"" and ""buts"" without coming to a definite conclusion that there was a prima facie case established. The Apex

Court further observed as under : -

With respect, we think that this is not what is required by the law as laid down by this Court in the case of Common Cause.

8. As recorded above, the second submission of the contesting respondents was that the main controversy is pending in the Administrative Tribunal

and that should be a Forum wherein it ought to be decided. The learned Advocate General referred us to the judgment rendered by the Apex

Court in the case of Ashok Kumar Pandey Vs. The State of West Bengal and Others, and particularly referred to the observations at page 285 in

para 16. In that paragraph the Apex Court has referred to an earlier judgment in the case of Dr. Duryodhan Sahu and Others Etc. Etc. Vs.

Jitendra Kumar Mishra and Others Etc. Etc., and has observed that in service matters PILS should not be entertained and the least the High Court

could do is to throw them out on the basis of the judgment rendered in Dr. Duryodhan Sahu's case. This judgment has been followed by a Division

Bench of this Court while rejecting a similar PIL in a service matter. That order has been rendered by the First Court on 25th August, 2004 in

P.I.L. No. 63 of 2003.

9. We have considered the submissions made by Mr. Jha appearing for the petitioners as well as by the Counsel appearing for the respondents.

We quite see the interest sought to be canvassed by the petitioners in clean administration. However, as has been observed by the Apex Court, if

they want an investigation, their first remedy is to approach the concerned Police Authorities of the State. We cannot proceed on the presumption

that the Authorities of the State will not take necessary action merely because some high officers of the State are involved. On the lodging of a

complaint if no appropriate action is taken, it will certainly be open to the petitioners to take further steps in view of the inaction or lack of proper

action on the part of the police Authorities of the State. Merely because some higher officers in the administration are involved and respondent No.

10 has tape-recorded some statements of one high official, presiding over the DPC, one cannot proceed to direct the C.B.I. to start investigation

into the matter. As stated above and as held by the Apex Court from time to time, the proper remedy is to approach the Police Authorities of the

State.

10. As far as the grievance of respondent No. 10 is concerned, we have noted that he has already filed the original application in the Central

Administrative Tribunal. The Administrative Tribunal Act gives adequate powers to the Tribunals to record the evidence and to arrive at the

appropriate decision. Section 22 of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 lays down the procedure and powers of Tribunals Sub-section (3)

gives the power to summon and enforce the attendance of any person and examine him on oath. Under Sub-clause (e), the Tribunal also has the

power to issue commissions for examination of witnesses or documents. In our view, this is a case where if respondent No. 10 applies to the

Tribunal for recording of the evidence, the Tribunal will consider that application appropriately. The Tribunal has adequate powers under this

section to record evidence and then to decide whether any injustice has been done to respondent No. 10 due to extraneous considerations. The

Tribunal will be the proper Forum to decide the grievance of respondent No. 10 on merits on which we are not expressing ourselves.

11. In the circumstances, as stated above, in our view, as far as the prayer of the petitioners for investigation through the C.B.I. is concerned, we

do not think that we should entertain the same. It will be open to the petitioners to move the appropriate Police Authorities of the State for the

reliefs in that behalf. Whenever the complaint is filed by the petitioners, the Authorities concerned will look into the same expeditiously. As far as

respondent No. 10 is concerned, he has filed the original application and it will be open for him to lead the necessary evidence to get his case

established in that Forum.

12. The petitioners and respondent No. 10 have produced the tapes of the recorded conversation which are lying with the Registrar General of this

Court. The Registrar General will transfer those tapes to the Central Administrative Tribunal when they are sought by the Central Administrative

Tribunal.

13. During the course of these proceedings, respondent No. 10 informed us that he has been transferred to the far off district of Gadchiroli on

promotion. He submitted that this transfer was made to a distant place so that it become difficult for him to proceed with the original application

which is pending in the Central Administrative Tribunal. The learned Advocate General pointed out to us that an order was passed by the First

Court in Suo Motu Writ Petition (PIL) No. 5629 of 2004 wherein the Division Bench has expressed that with a view to take care of the problem

of mal-nutrition in the tribal areas, Senior Officers be posted in those areas. It is in pursuance of that direction that good number of officers are now

being posted in tribal areas and this list includes the name of respondent No. 10 who was to be posted on promotion at Gadchiroli. However,

having noted the fact that respondent No. 10 has filed the original application which is to be heard in the Central Administrative Tribunal, Mumbai,

we suggested the learned Advocate General that if possible, respondent No. 10 be retained at a place nearer to Mumbai. He has taken

instructions in that behalf and the State Government has issued an order on 21st February, 2005 posting respondent No. 10 as the Project Officer

of the Integrated tribal development scheme at Jawar in District Thane. This will enable respondent No. 10 to remain at a nearer place and to

prosecute his original application which he has filed in the Administrative Tribunal. We expect the Tribunal to decide it expeditiously.

14. With the aforesaid observations, we dismiss this petition.