



2026:DHC:8177



\$~28

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
% **Date of Decision: September 21st, 2026**

CNR No. DLHC010352792025+ **W.P.(C) 7775/2025****SURENDRA KUMAR**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Aishvary Vikram, Mr. V.C.
Shukla, Mr. Lucky Sharma &
Mr. Yash Jain, Advs.

versus

**THE CENTRAL VIGILANCE COMMISSION
& ANR.**

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Tatini Basu & Ms. Esha
Thawal, Advs. for R1

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN****AMIT MAHAJAN, J. (Oral)**

1. By the present petition, the petitioner essentially challenges the email dated 07.02.2025 sent by Respondent No. 1 pursuant to which the complaint preferred by the petitioner against the Indian Overseas Bank in relation to sanction of term loan of ₹28.50 crores to one M/s Horizon Buildcon Private Limited for construction of a real estate project was closed.

2. Briefly, it is the petitioner's case that his wife and son are part of the many homebuyers in a project named 'IRIDIA'. The said project was proposed to be constructed on a land measuring approximately 23,114 square metres belonging to M/s Kaveri Sahkari Avas Samiti Limited who entered into a collaboration agreement with one M/s Horizon Buildcon Private Limited (hereafter '**developer**') for



development and construction of multi-storey flats. It is the case of the petitioner that the developer and M/s Kaveri failed to obtain the requisite non-interference order from a Court of competent jurisdiction before commencement of the project as a consequence of which the project was halted by the NOIDA Authority for which a civil suit was also filed in the year 2012. Subsequently, in the year 2014, the NOIDA Authority also issued notice to M/s. Kaveri to cease construction and demolish the structure on the said land.

3. During this period, on 24.12.2013, the Indian Overseas Bank sanctioned a loan of ₹28.50 crores to the Developer. It is the petitioner's case that the sanction of loan was subject to various pre-conditions and despite the non-fulfilment of the pre-conditions by the developer, the Indian Overseas Bank disbursed the loan to the developer thereby indicating the probability of collusion and corruption between the bank officials and the developer. Against the same, the petitioner preferred a complaint to Respondent No. 1 thereby alleging conspiracy and corruption on the part of the bank officials in disbursement of loan of ₹28.50 crores to the developer. The said complaint was closed by Respondent No. 1 *vide* email dated 07.02.2025 without disclosing any reason for closure of the complaint.

4. The petitioner is essentially aggrieved that his complaint was closed by Respondent No. 1 without assigning any reasons or providing any detailed report for closure of complaint.

5. On being asked, the learned counsel for Respondent No. 1 informs that the complaint was closed since the complaint did not reveal any irregular act that involved a vigilance angle. She states that as per the complaint handling policy, the commission only dealt with



complaints in the matters of corruption and irregular acts having a vigilance angle. She states that after the complaint of the petitioner was received on the portal, the complaint was forwarded to the CVO, Indian Overseas Bank/Respondent No. 2 who thereafter submitted an Investigation Report to Respondent No.1. She further states that after a consideration of investigation report submitted by Respondent No. 2, since no vigilance angle was involved, the complaint of the petitioner was closed.

6. The petitioner is aggrieved by the sanction of loan of ₹28.50 crore by the Indian Overseas Bank to the developer without insisting on fulfilment of certain pre-conditions for the sanction of loan. Having heard the counsel and perused the record, the case of the petitioner before this Court, at the highest, is only that his complaint was closed by Respondent No. 1 without assigning any reasons.

7. While the email dated 07.02.2025 pursuant to which the petitioner's complaint was closed by Respondent No. 1 does not disclose any reason, this Court has had the benefit of perusing the Investigation Report submitted by Respondent No. 2 to Respondent No. 1 which formed the basis for the closure of the complaint. The Investigation Report delineates the various conditions imposed by the bank before sanctioning the loan to the developer. The Investigation Report further records the satisfaction of the sanctioning authority of the fulfilment of the requisite conditions before the loan was sanctioned.

8. As submitted on behalf of Respondent No. 1, the said Investigation Report was duly considered and as per the Comprehensive Guidelines on Complaint Handling Mechanism, 2021,



since the commission only dealt with complaints in matters of corruption and irregular acts having the vigilance angle, and the concerned authority was duly satisfied that the present case did not involve any such vigilance angle, the complaint of the petitioner was closed.

9. Recording satisfaction as to whether the complaint of the petitioner involved any irregularity warranting scrutiny or not fell within the domain of Respondent No. 1. This Court in exercise of jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India cannot issue a writ to the concerned authorities to take a different view. The complaint in the present case was closed by Respondent No. 1 after holistically considering the factual matrix of the present case and the Investigation Report submitted by Respondent No. 2.

10. This Court therefore does not find any demonstrable perversity in the same so as to warrant interference by this Court.

11. The petitioner, at this stage, also contends that he is not being supplied a copy of the Investigation Report. In that regard, this Court deems it appropriate to note that the Investigation Report is an internal document and petitioner is at liberty to take requisite steps to obtain the same in accordance with law. The same, however, is not the purport of the present petition.

12. As noted above, no perversity meriting any interference by this Court has been demonstrated.

13. The present petition is accordingly dismissed.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 21, 2026/“SS”