GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRYOF RAILWAYS
RAILWAY BOARD

No. 2006/V-1/CVC/1/10 New Delhi, dated 14th August, 2006

Sub:- Difference of opinion between State Anti Corruption Bureaus and Central Government authorities regarding Sanction of prosecution of Central Government officials.

The Central Vigilance Commission have noted certain instances where the competent authority in the concerned Central Government organization has declined the request of the State ACB for sanction of prosecution against certain central government officials, in cases investigated by the concerned State ACB. The CVC has felt that there is a need to establish a mechanism to resolve such differences of opinion between the State ACBs and the Central Government Authorities.

2. In this connection, it may be mentioned that such a mechanism has been provided for in para 11.2 of Chapter VII of Vigilance Manual (Volume-I), of the Central Vigilance Commission in respect of cases investigated by the Central Bureau of Investigation. The relevant provisions are extracted below:-
(a) In the case of government servants, the competent authority may refer the case to its Administrative Ministry/Department which may after considering the matter, either direct that prosecution should be sanctioned by the competent authority or by an authority higher to the competent authority, or in support of the view of the competent authority, forward the case to the Central Vigilance Commission along with its own comments and all relevant material for resolving the difference of opinion between the competent authority and the CBI. If the Commission advises grant of sanction for prosecution but the Ministry/Department concerned proposes not to accept such advice, the case should be referred to DOP&T for a final decision.

(b) In the case of public servants, other than government servants (i.e. employees of local bodies, autonomous bodies, public sector organizations, nationalized banks, insurance companies etc.) the competent authority may communicate its views to the Chief Executive of the Organisation, who may either direct that sanction for prosecution should be given or in support of the views of the competent authority, have the case forwarded to the Central Vigilance Commission for resolving the difference of opinion between the competent authority and the CBI.

3. The CVC has decided that the same procedure be followed in respect of difference of opinion on action to be taken on the recommendations of the State Anti Corruption Bureaus also, in respect of cases investigated by them. Such cases should be dealt with as provided above, and if the difference of opinion persists, the case should be referred to the CVC, irrespective of the level of the official involved, whether he is under the normal advisory jurisdiction of the CVC or not.

4. The above instructions may be noted for strict compliance in letter and spirit.

DA/Nil

(Sanjay Goel)
Director Vigilance (M)
Railway Board

No. 2006/V-1/CVC/1/10
New Delhi, dated 14th August, 2006
Copy to: The Secretary, Central Vigilance Commission, (Attention: Sh. V. Kannan, Director), Satarkata Bhawan, Block-A, GPO Complex, INA, New Delhi for information w.r.t. their Office Order No. 23/6/06 contained in their letter No. 006/DSP/002 dated 23-06-2006.

(Sanjay Goel)  
Director Vigilance (M)  
Railway Board  

No. 2006/V-1/CVC/1/10 New Delhi, dated 14th August, 2006

Copy to: The General Manager (Vigilance), All Indian Railway/Production Units for information and necessary action.

(Sanjay Goel)  
Director Vigilance (M)  
Railway Board  

Copy to: E(O)I, ERB-I and ERB(D) – for information

Copy to: All Officers and the Branches of Vigilance Directorate.