Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6812 **Dated:** 22/10/2026

Case No: DNO/26/CCPD/6812

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Onkar Nath

Versus

Respondent(s)

1. The Director General, Sports Authority of India

2. The Secretary, Ministry of Communications

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, Shri Onkar Nath, a person with 40% locomotor disability and a Group 'A' officer of the Indian Radio Regulatory Service (IRRS), presently working as Deputy Wireless Adviser in the Department of Telecommunications (DoT), submitted a complaint dated 22.08.2026 against the Sports Authority of India (SAI) and the Chief Vigilance Officer (CVO), SAI. He stated that he was on deputation with SAI and was repatriated to his parent department, DoT, at the request of DoT due to shortage of staff. He was relieved from SAI on 06.07.2026 and joined DoT on 07.07.2026. The applicant alleged that SAI has not issued/transmitted his Vigilance Clearance, despite there being no pending charge sheet, disciplinary proceedings or judicial proceedings against him. He stated that due to non-receipt of the Vigilance Clearance, DoT has not been able to process and release his salary since his joining in July 2026. He further stated that the non-payment of salary has caused financial hardship to him and his family, as he is the sole earning member. He has had to use his personal savings to meet household expenses and is facing difficulty in paying his children's school fees and EMIs. The Complainant alleged that the withholding

of Vigilance Clearance and consequent non-payment of salary amounts to administrative harassment and has caused hardship to him as a PwBD employee. He has therefore sought intervention under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016.

2. Hearing

2.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 09.10.2026 wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Onkar Nath	Complainant
2.	Shri Aakash Pundir, Deputy Director, Sports Authority of India	Respondent 1
3.	Shri Harpreet Singh, Director, DoT	Respondent 2

3. Record of Proceedings

3.1 During the proceedings, the Complainant reiterated his grievance and the representative of SAI, Shri Aakash Pundir, Deputy Director, submitted that SAI had filed its reply before the Court by email on 07.10.2026. He stated that the Complainant had been repatriated at the request of DoT and that SAI had forwarded his Last Pay Certificate (LPC) to DoT on 21.07.2026. Salary up to 06.07.2026 had been disbursed by SAI, while subsequent salary was payable by DoT.

3.2 Regarding vigilance clearance, the representative of SAI submitted that a show-cause notice had been issued to the Complainant during his tenure at SAI and that a representation had subsequently been received from him. He referred to the Central Vigilance Commission's circular dated 01.09.2022, stating that where misconduct is detected in the borrowing organisation, the matter may be brought to the notice of the parent department after due inquiry for further action. He stated that SAI had forwarded the relevant file to DoT vide letter dated 14.08.2026 and that no further action was pending at SAI's end.

Diary No. DNO/26/CCPD/6812 **Dated:** 22/10/2026

3.3 The representative of DoT, Shri Harpreet Singh, Director (Administration-II & PSA), representing the Secretary, Department of Telecommunications, submitted that the vigilance matter remained pending as the alleged misconduct pertained to the Complainant's tenure at SAI. He stated that DoT had received the file from SAI but that the requisite vigilance-related clarification had not been furnished. However, considering the hardship being faced by the Complainant, DoT had taken him on strength and released his salary.

3.4 Upon being asked by the Court, the representative of DoT confirmed that the Complainant's salary had been released on or around 05.10.2026. The Court expressed concern over the delay in releasing the salary despite the Complainant having joined his parent department in July 2026 and having followed up on the matter. The Court observed that the delay had continued for approximately two months and sought clarification from the concerned representatives regarding the same.

3.5 The Complainant confirmed receipt of the salary on 07.10.2026 and expressed gratitude to the Court for its intervention. He also raised certain additional issues, including the status of his Annual Performance Appraisal Report (APAR) and accommodation-related dues. The Court clarified that the principal grievance concerning the release of salary had been redressed.

3.6 The Court advised the Complainant to raise any remaining grievances before the designated Grievance Redressal Officer (GRO) of the concerned department. It was observed that, if such grievances were not redressed within 14 days, the Complainant could approach the Court by filing a fresh complaint. Consequently, the Court has determined no further intervention necessary.

4. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Yours faithfully,



(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner