Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6378 **Dated:** 09/10/2026

Case No: DNO/26/CCPD/6378

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Vikas Nain

Versus

Respondent(s)

1. The Chairman, Central Board of Indirect Taxes and Customs

2. The Chief Commissioner, Cadre Controlling Authority CGST & Central Excise

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, Shri Vikas Nain, a person with 52% hearing impairment submitted a grievance dated 14.07.2026 and stated that he joined the Central GST Department as an Inspector on 05.07.2017 and completed his two-year probation on 05.07.2019. However, even after more than seven years, he has neither been issued a formal confirmation order nor informed that he is deemed to have been confirmed. He further stated that his request for technical resignation with retention of lien was accepted by the department on 20.10.2023, thereby recognizing his eligibility for lien. He alleged that the Office of the Accountant General (A&E), Haryana, Chandigarh has repeatedly sought clarification from the concerned department regarding his confirmation/deemed confirmation status so that his pay protection and past service benefits could be processed. However, despite repeated communications, representations and a CPGRAMS complaint, the matter remains unresolved. He stated that his CPGRAMS complaint was closed on 15.05.2025 without providing any relief or resolving the issue. Due to the continued delay, his pay protection and other consequential service benefits have not been processed, resulting in financial loss and

mental harassment.

2. Hearing

2.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 18.08.2026 wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Ravish Kumar, Under Secretary	Respondent 1
2.	Shri Rajeev Gupta, Pr. CC CGST (Vadodara Zone)	Respondent 2

2.2 No representatives on behalf of the Complainant were present during the proceedings.

3. Record of Proceedings

3.1 During the proceedings, the Respondent No. 2 submitted that the Complainant had joined the Department as an Inspector on 05.07.2017 and had successfully completed his prescribed probation on 05.07.2019. The Respondent stated that, in terms of para 27 of DoPT O.M. No. 28023/3/2018-Estt. (C) dated 11.03.2019, the Complainant was liable to be treated as deemed confirmed upon successful completion of the probationary period. In this regard, the Respondent submitted that Establishment Order No. 91/2026 dated 17.08.2026 had been issued by the Office of the Chief Commissioner, Central GST and Central Excise, Vadodara Zone, formally recording the Complainant as “deemed confirmed” in the grade of Inspector. The said order records his date of joining as 05.07.2017 and successful completion of probation as 05.07.2019.

3.2 The Respondent No. 2 further submitted that the deemed confirmation order had been issued after obtaining the requisite report from the concerned Commissionerate/Zone and had been communicated to the Complainant as well as his present employer. The Respondent No. 2 stated that the order was issued to address the confirmation status required by the Complainant for processing his consequential service benefits. The Establishment Order itself records that a copy was forwarded to Shri Vikas Nain and to the

concerned authorities.

3.3 However, the Court observed that there had been an undue and prolonged delay in formally resolving and communicating the Complainant's confirmation status. The Court noted that although the Complainant had completed his probation in July 2019, the formal deemed confirmation order was issued only on 17.08.2026. The Court observed that keeping an employee without clear confirmation of his service status or appropriate written communication for such a prolonged period, without adequate justification, cannot be treated as a proper administrative practice.

3.4 The Court further observed that the grievance had ultimately been redressed through issuance of the deemed confirmation order. However, the Respondents were advised to ensure that such undue delay does not recur and that matters relating to probation, confirmation and consequential service benefits, particularly in respect of employees with disabilities, are dealt with expeditiously and in accordance with the applicable rules and instructions.

3.5 The Respondents were also advised to ensure that appropriate mechanisms are put in place so that employees are timely informed of their confirmation status upon completion of the prescribed probationary period and are not required to pursue the matter through repeated representations or grievance mechanisms for obtaining an administrative order that is otherwise due under the applicable rules. In view of the issuance of Establishment Order No. 91/2026 and the consequent redressal of the Complainant's immediate grievance, the Court determined that no further intervention was necessary in the matter at this stage.

4. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Yours faithfully,

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner