CIRCULAR No.08/05/15

Sub: Guidelines to be followed by the administrative authorities competent to accord sanction for prosecution u/s.19 of the PC Act - 1988 - Hon’ble Supreme Court Judgment in Criminal Appeal No. 1838 of 2013 - reg.

Ref: CVC Office Order No.31/5/05 dated 12.05.2005
CVC Circular No.07/03/12 dated 28.03.2012

***

The Commission has been emphasising the need for quick and expeditious decisions on requests of sanction for prosecution received from CBI/other investigating agencies under the PC Act, 1988 and also to strictly adhere to the time limit of three months for grant or otherwise of sanction for prosecution laid down by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in Vineet Narain & Ors. Vs. Union of India (AIR 1998 SC 889). Despite these instructions and close monitoring of such pending matters; the Commission has been concerned with the serious delays persisting in processing requests for sanction for prosecution by the Competent Authorities.

2. The Commission had earlier vide its Office Order No. 31/5/05 dt. 12/05/2005 brought to the notice of all competent authorities guidelines to be followed by the sanctioning authorities. Subsequently, the Apex Court in the matter of Dr. Subramanian Swamy Vs. Dr. Manmohan Singh & another (Civil Appeal No. 1193 of 2012) referred to the above guidelines of CVC, and observed that, “the aforementioned guidelines are in conformity with the law laid down by this Court that while considering the issue regarding grant or refusal of sanction, the only thing which the Competent Authority is required to see is whether the material placed by the complainant or the investigating agency prima facie discloses commission of an offence. The Competent Authority cannot undertake a detailed inquiry to decide whether or not the allegations made against the public servant are true”. Thereafter, the Commission vide circular No.07/03/12 dated 28/03/2012 reiterated its guidelines dated 12/05/2005 and advised all concerned Competent Authorities to adhere to the time limits for processing requests for prosecution sanction under Section 19 of PC Act as laid down by the Apex Court in letter and spirit.

3. The Hon’ble Supreme Court has recently in Criminal Appeal No. 1838 of 2013 in the matter of CBI Vs. Ashok Kumar Aggarwal, in para 7 of the judgment observed that “there is an obligation on the sanctioning authority to discharge its duty to give or withhold sanction only after having full knowledge
of the material facts of the case. Grant of sanction is not a mere formality. Therefore, the provisions in regard to the sanction must be observed with complete strictness keeping in mind the public interest and the protection available to the accused against whom the sanction is sought. Sanction lifts the bar for prosecution. Therefore, it is not an acrimonious exercise but a solemn and sacrosanct act which affords protection to the Government servant against frivolous prosecution. Further, it is a weapon to discourage vexatious prosecution and is a safeguard for the innocent, though not a shield for the guilty”.

4. In para 8 of the above judgment, the Court has issued guidelines to be followed with complete strictness by the Competent Authorities while considering grant of sanction as below:-

a). The prosecution must send the entire relevant record to the sanctioning authority including the FIR, disclosure statements, statements of witnesses, recovery memos, draft charge-sheet and all other relevant material. The record so sent should also contain the material/document, if any, which may tilt the balance in favour of the accused and on the basis of which, the competent authority may refuse sanction.

b). The authority itself has to do complete and conscious scrutiny of the whole record so produced by the prosecution independently applying its mind and taking into consideration all the relevant facts before grant of sanction while discharging its duty to give or withhold the sanction.

c). The power to grant sanction is to be exercised strictly keeping in mind the public interest and the protection available to the accused against whom the sanction is sought.

d). The order of sanction should make it evident that the authority had been aware of all relevant facts/materials and had applied its mind to all the relevant material.

e). In every individual case, the prosecution has to establish and satisfy the court by leading evidence that the entire relevant facts had been placed before the sanctioning authority and the authority had applied its mind on the same and that the sanction had been granted in accordance with law.

5. The Commission, would therefore, in terms of its powers and functions under Section 8(1) (f) of the CVC Act, 2003 direct all administrative authorities to scrupulously follow the guidelines contained in para 2 (l) to (vii) of Commission’s circular No 31/5/05 dated 12/05/2005 and the recent explicit guidelines laid down for compliance by the Hon’ble Supreme Court at para 4 above, while considering and deciding requests for sanction for prosecution. Since non-compliance of the above guidelines vitiates the sanction for prosecution, therefore, competent sanctioning authorities should discharge their obligations with complete strictness and would be held responsible for any deviation / non-adherence and issues questioning the validity of sanction arising at a later stage in matters of sanction for prosecution.
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