Office Order No. 51/9/03

To

(i) The Secretaries of All Ministries/Departments of Government of India
(ii) The Chief Secretaries to All Union Territories
(iii) The Comptroller & Auditor General of India
(iv) The Chairman, Union Public Service Commission
(v) The Executives of All PSEs/Public Sector Banks/Insurance Companies/Autonomous Organisations/Societies
(vi) The Chief Vigilance Officers in the Ministries/Departments/PSEs./Public Sector Banks/Insurance companies/Autonomous Organisations/Societies
(vii) President’s Secretariat/Vice-President’s Secretariat/Lok Sabha Secretariat/Rajya Sabha Secretariat/PMO

Subject:- Need for self-contained speaking and reasoned order to be issued by the authorities exercising disciplinary powers.

Sir/Madam,

It was clarified in the Department of Personnel & Administrative Reforms’ OM No. 134/11/81/AVD-I dated 13.07.1981 that the disciplinary proceedings against employees conducted under the provisions of CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965, or under any other corresponding rules, are quasi-judicial in nature and therefore, it is necessary that orders issued by such authorities should have the attributes of a judicial order. It was also clarified that the recording of reasons in support of a decision by a quasi-judicial authority is obligatory as it ensures that the decision is reached according to law and is not a result of caprice, whim or fancy, or reached on ground of policy or expediency. Such orders passed by the competent disciplinary/appellate authority as do not contain the reasons on the basis whereof the decisions communicated by that order were reached, are liable to be held invalid if challenged in a court of law.

2. It is also a well-settled law that the disciplinary/appellate authority is required to apply its own mind to the facts and circumstances of the case and to come to its own conclusions, though it may consult an outside agency like the CVC. There have been some cases in which the orders passed by the competent authorities did not indicate application of mind, but a mere endorsement of the Commission’s recommendations. In one case, the competent authority had merely
endorsed the Commission’s recommendations for dropping the proposal for criminal proceedings against the employee. In other case, the disciplinary authority had imposed the penalty of removal from service on an employee, on the recommendations of the Commission, but had not discussed, in the order passed by it, the reasons for not accepting the representation of the concerned employee on the findings of the inquiring authority. Courts have quashed both the orders on the ground of non-application of kind by the concerned authorities.

3. It is once again brought to the notice of all disciplinary/appellate authorities that Disciplinary Authorities should issue a self-contained, speaking and reasoned orders conforming to the aforesaid legal requirements, which must indicate, inter-alia, the application of mind by the authority issuing the order.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/-
(Anjana Dube)
Deputy Secretary