Sub: Proposed agenda items for the SDGMs/CVOs Conference
Ref: This office letters of even number dated 20.04.12, 22.06.12 & 28.6.12

Apart from agenda items advised to all Zonal Railways/PUs vide this office letters of even number dated 20.04.12, 22.06.12 & 28.6.12, the following additional items suggested by West Central Railway are also proposed to be included in the agenda of SDGMs/CVOs Conference:

1. **Anomaly in the definition of Major Penalty:**

   As per para 807 (iii-b) of IRVM the minor penalty is reduction to lower stage in the time scale of pay by one stage for a period not exceeding 36 months, without cumulative effect. Similarly, as per para 807 (v) of IRVM, the major penalty is defined as "Save as provided in Clause (iii-b), reduction to a lower stage in the time scale of pay for a specified period, with further directions as to whether on the expiry of such period, the reduction will or will not have the effect of postponing the future increments of railway servant's pay." As per this clause, the DAs are imposing a major penalty of reduction of pay in the same time scale by 2 stages for a period of 3 months without cumulative effect, which becomes much less as compared to the penalty mentioned under para 807 (iii-b). In fact, the major penalty should be at least more than 1 stage lower in the same time scale of pay for 36 months without cumulative effect. The same has also been provided under para 807(v) of IRVM, viz. "Save as provided in Clause (iii-b)". Accordingly, major penalty under clause 807(v) may be modified.

   This is necessary to avoid frequent suo-moto revisions to be sought by vigilance as in several cases, the quantum of punishment imposed by DA's under major penalties is very less and effectively less than minor penalties.
2. **Consultation with vigilance branch regarding adequacy of punishment being imposed:**

- In terms of Railway Board's letter No E/D&A/2000/RG6-30 dated 16.05.2001, in case of Major penalty, DA has to send provisional order for vigilance consultation if the proposed penalty is at variance with vigilance advice (Minor or exoneration in lieu of Major), that too only once time. Similarly, consultation with vigilance is also necessary by AA and RA if the proposed penalty is at variance with vigilance advice.

It is proposed that consultation with vigilance should be mandatory before imposition of major penalty irrespective of the quantum of penalty being proposed by DA, AA or RA in all major penalty cases to see the adequacy of the punishment also.

3. **Reduction in frequency of inter-zone vigilance audit:**

- Inter-zonal vigilance audit may be at an interval of six months. This may be considered by Railway Board.

4. **Irregularities in collection of Linen charges in Garib Rath train:**

- On WCR, PCs on the aspect of collection of linen charges from passengers by coach attendants revealed that coach attendants are pocketing money collected from passengers in lieu of linen given to them, without getting proper EFTs issued from TTEs. To avoid such irregularity, WCR vigilance is of the opinion that in Garib Rath trains, linen charges may be included in the fare itself as done in the case of other trains. Railway Board may consider and issue suitable instructions in this regard.

5. **Overloading in leased accommodations:**

- On WCR, PCs on leased accommodations i.e. SLRs and AGCs reveal that overloading is rampant. To safeguard Railway's interest of earnings & passenger safety, WCR vigilance is of the opinion that:

  **Short term:**

  The present penalty of Rs. 5000/- may be enhanced to Rs. 50,000/- or five times of daily freight paid by lease holder, whichever is less.

  **Long term:**

  Since leasing policy will continue in years to come, Railway can think of providing sensor based weight indication in SLRs/AGCs to ensure correct loading.

6. **Review of number of PCs per VI:**

In comparison to the vigilance work load on the zonal railways, the number of VIs and officers are less, due to which sometimes it is not possible to complete the investigations timely in the verified complained cases or as a result of preventive checks. As such, it is suggested that the number of PCs per VI, 40 in a year, may
be reduced suitably, so that, CVIs/VIIs are able to investigate the complained cases timely in view of many complaints being received on zonal railways.

You are requested to come prepared with your comments for discussion on the above mentioned additional Agenda items for the Conference.

(Vikas Purwar)
Director Vigilance (Mech.)
Railway Board