

Case study 2

Group members

Amit (GL)	A 16
Saurabh Pandey	A 36
Vipul Kumar	A 19
Sundaram Chaube	A 38
Ayush Tiwari	A 21
Kumar Archit	A 49
Puneet Dhiman	A 37
Alok Ojha	A 58
Vikas Tanwar	A 60
Gaurav Tiwari	A 63

CASE

- ▶ You are heading a leading Technical Institute of the country. The institute is planning to convene an interview panel shortly under your chairmanship for selection of the post of supervisors. A few days before the interview, you get a call from the Personal Secretary of a senior Government functionary seeking your intervention in favour of selection of a close relative of the functionary for this post. The PS also informs you that he is aware of the long pending and urgent proposals of your institute for grant of funds for modernization, which are awaiting the functionary's approval. He assures you that he would get these proposals cleared.

POSSIBLE ACTION

1. Reject the offer of the PS, and prepare to face the consequences.
2. Negotiate with the PS trying to make him understand that this would be unethical and unprofessional.
3. Informing to the PS that I would talk to the interview board in this regard, and do as per their suggestion.
4. Lodge a complaint with the Anti-corruption cell.
5. Contact the superior authority of the PS, and ask for their help.

Option 1

- ▶ Although it would be unethical to comply with the PS directions, but since the stake of the institute depends on the grant of the aid, an outright attitude might bring negative consequences for the institute.
- ▶ Thus, it might not be rational to reject his offer outrightly.

Option 2

- ▶ An attempt should be made to make the PS understand that his course of action is unethical and unprofessional.
- ▶ However, this course might not address the concern if the PS did not change his mind.

Option 3

- ▶ Trying to communicate to the interview panel about the PS's proposal is a justifiable idea, as the panel takes the decision together.
- ▶ Such communication should make it clear that any demand of such unjust favor would not be answered.
- ▶ However, This option might not address the concern of the institute grants.

Option 4

- ▶ Lodging a complaint with the anti-corruption cell might not be practical as there would be no evidence to support the allegation and the case would ultimately be discarded without any disciplinary action.
- ▶ This might also offend the PS and he may create complications in approving the grants.

Option 5

- ▶ The most practical solution to this problem could be, to reject the demand of the PS tactfully, and contacting the superior authority of the PS, regarding the PS demand and unjust basis of it.

Conclusion

- ▶ Since the PS is asking for the undue favor, it would be unethical to succumb to the pressure and make unethical decision.
- ▶ Even if the PS attempts to delay the grants approval without any reason, the option of RTI might be resorted to know the reason for disapproval.
- ▶ The institute may lodge complaint with the appropriate authority.