
(2026) 03 CAT CK 0414

In the Central Administrative Tribunal, Principal Bench: New Delhi

Case No : Original Application No. 589 Of 2026

Narinder Singh

APPELLANT

Vs

Government Of NCT Of Delhi & Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 12-03-2026

Acts Referred:

Prevention Of Corruption Act, 1988 — Section 19

Central Civil Services (Classification, Control And Appeal) Rules, 1965 — Rule 10(1)

Citation : (2026) 03 CAT CK 0414

Hon'ble Judges : Ranjit More, Chairman;Rajinder Kashyap, Member (A)

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : Esha Mazumdar, Muskan, H A Khan

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

Ranjit More, Chairman

1. Heard Ms. Mazumdar, learned counsel for the applicant and Mr. Khan, learned counsel for the respondents.

2. By filing the present O.A., the applicant has challenged the suspension order dated 10.08.2022 and the subsequent extension orders dated 28.10.2022, 02.05.2023, 27.10.2023, 29.01.2024, 23. 07.2024, 16.01.2025, 18.07.2025 and 19.01.2026.

3. The applicant was placed under suspension vide order dated 10.08.2022 under Rule 10(1) of the CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965 as disciplinary proceedings were contemplated against him. As stated above, thereafter the applicant's suspension orders were continued from time to time and the last order in that regard was issued on 19.01.2026.

4. Ms. Mazumdar, learned counsel for the applicant, has invited our attention to the fact that eight officers were suspended along with the applicant on identical allegations, however, their suspension was not continued beyond 19.01.2026. A

specific pleading to that effect has been made in paragraph 10 of the O.A., which reads as follows:

"10. That on 10.08.2022, the Applicant was placed under suspension vide impugned order dated 10.08.2022 under Rule 10 of CCS (CCA) Rules, 1965 along with other officers/officials of Respondent No. 3 namely:

- i. Sh. Pankaj Bhatnagar, Assistant Commissioner Excise
- ii. Sh. Neeraj Gupta, Assistant Commissioner Excise
- iii. Sh. Subhash Ranjan, Section Officer
- iv. Smt. Suman, Section Officer
- v. Sh. Kuljeet Singh, Section Officer
- vi. Sh. Sachin Solanki, ASO
- vii. Sh. Satyabrata Bhargava, ASO
- viii. Sh. Gaurav Mann, ASO"

The aforesaid fact is not disputed by Mr. Khan, learned counsel for the respondents.

5. Ms. Mazumdar further submits that one of the grounds for continuation of suspension vide order dated 19.01.2026 was that prosecution sanction had been granted to the CBI against the applicant under Section 19 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 vide letter dated 22.11.2023 and that the learned Special Judge(PC ACT) (CBI)-23,(MPs/ MLAs Cases) Rouse Avenue Court, had taken cognizance against the applicant vide order dated 15.12.2022. She submits that the eight persons referred to hereinabove were not arrayed in the CBI charge-sheet and, therefore, their suspension was not continued.

6. Ms. Mazumdar, learned counsel for the applicant, has also placed on record the decision dated 27.02.2026 passed by the learned learned Special Judge(PC ACT) (CBI)-23,(MPs/ MLAs Cases) Rouse Avenue Court in CBI Case No. 56/2022, and submits that the accused therein, including the present applicant, have been discharged. This fact is not disputed by Mr. Khan, learned counsel for the respondents. Mr. Khan, however, submits that the CBI has approached the Hon'ble Delhi High Court challenging the said order.

7. Fact remains that, as on date, the applicant stands discharged and there is no prosecution pending against him. The case of the applicant, therefore, appears to be identically situated with the eight persons referred to above as well as accused No. 1, i.e., Shri Kuldeep Singh, in the criminal proceedings.

8. Ms. Mazumdar further submits that one of the grounds to challenge the charge-sheet and continuation of suspension is that the charge-sheet in the departmental proceedings was issued after 270 days. It is the contention of

learned counsel for the applicant that the suspension of the applicant after 270 days could not have been continued.

9. In the above facts and circumstances, we are of the opinion that the respondents/competent authority/disciplinary authority must reconsider into the matter in light of the decision dated 27.02.2026 referred hereinabove, and pass an appropriate order as expeditiously as possible and in any case within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of this order.

10. So far as the issue of back wages is concerned, the respondents/disciplinary authority shall consider the same at the appropriate stage.

11. With the above directions, the present OA stands disposed of.