

No. 004/VGL/18  
Government of India  
Central Vigilance Commission  
\*\*\*\*\*

Satarkata Bhawan, Block-A,  
GPO Complex, INA,  
New Delhi-1100 23.  
Dated: 13<sup>th</sup> April, 2004

**Office Order No. 23/04/04**

**Subject: Vigilance angle – definition of.**

As you are aware, the Commission tenders advice in the cases, which involve a vigilance angle. The term “vigilance angle” has been defined in the Special Chapters for Vigilance Management in the public sector enterprises, public sector banks and public sector insurance companies. The matter with regard to bringing out greater quality and precision to the definition has been under reconsideration of the Commission. The Commission, now accordingly, has formulated a revised definition of vigilance angle as under:

**“Vigilance angle is obvious in the following acts: -**

- (i) Demanding and/or accepting gratification other than legal remuneration in respect of an official act or for using his influence with any other official.
  - (ii) Obtaining valuable thing, without consideration or with inadequate consideration from a person with whom he has or likely to have official dealings or his subordinates have official dealings or where he can exert influence.
  - (iii) Obtaining for himself or for any other person any valuable thing or pecuniary advantage by corrupt or illegal means or by abusing his position as a public servant.
  - (iv) Possession of assets disproportionate to his known sources of income.
  - (v) Cases of misappropriation, forgery or cheating or other similar criminal offences.
2. There are, however, other irregularities where circumstances will have to be weighed carefully to take a view whether the officer’s integrity is in doubt. Gross or willful negligence; recklessness in decision making; blatant violations of systems and procedures; exercise of discretion in excess, where no ostensible/public interest is evident; failure to keep the controlling authority/superiors informed in time – **these are some of the irregularities where the disciplinary authority with the help of the CVO should carefully study the case and weigh the circumstances to come to a conclusion whether there is reasonable ground to doubt the integrity of the officer concerned.**

3. The raison d'être of vigilance activity is not to reduce but to enhance the level of managerial efficiency and effectiveness in the organisation. Commercial risk taking forms part of business. Therefore, every loss caused to the organisation, either in pecuniary or non-pecuniary terms, need not necessarily become the subject matter of a vigilance inquiry. Thus, whether a person of common prudence, working within the ambit of the prescribed rules, regulations and instructions, would have taken the decision in the prevailing circumstances in the commercial/operational interests of the organisation is one possible criterion for determining the bona fides of the case. A positive response to this question may indicate the existence of bona- fides. A negative reply, on the other hand, might indicate their absence.

4. Absence of vigilance angle in various acts of omission and commission does not mean that the concerned official is not liable to face the consequences of his actions. **All such lapses not attracting vigilance angle would, indeed, have to be dealt with appropriately as per the disciplinary procedure under the service rules."**

5. The above definition becomes a part of the Vigilance Manual and existing Special Chapter on Public Sector Banks and Public Sector Enterprises brought out by the Commission, in supersession of the existing definition.

CVOs may bring this to the notice of all concerned.

Sd/-  
(Anjana Dube)  
Deputy Secretary

All Chief Vigilance Officers