

**WRAP Exams · wrapexams.com**

Prelims PYQ, Mains model answers, and copy evaluation. Write to the desk for this paper, a doubt, or the AI waitlist.

**ask@wrapexams.com · +91 85951 84903 · wrapexams.com**

Q8

**Case study. Ramesh is State Civil Services Officer who got the opportunity of getting posted to the capital of a border State after rendering 20 years of service. Ramesh's mother has recently been detected cancer and has been admitted in the leading cancer hospital of the city. His two adolescent children have also got admission in one of the best public schools of the town. After settling down in his appointment as Director in the Home Department of the State, Ramesh got confidential report through intelligence sources that illegal migrants are infiltrating in the State from the neighbouring country. He decided to personally carry out surprise check of the border posts along with his Home Department team. To his surprise, he caught red-handed two families of 12 members infiltrated with the connivance of the security personnel at the border posts. On further inquiry and investigation, it was found that after the migrants from neighbouring country infiltrate, their documentation like Aadhaar Card, Ration Card and Voter Card are also forged and they are made to settle down in a particular area of the State. Ramesh prepared the detailed and comprehensive report and submitted to the Additional Secretary of the State. However, he has summoned by the Additional Home Secretary after a week and was instructed to withdraw the report. The Additional Home Secretary informed Ramesh that the report submitted by him has not been appreciated by the higher authorities. He further cautioned him that if he fails to withdraw the confidential report, he will not only be posted out from the prestigious appointment from the State capital but his further promotion which is due in near future will also get in jeopardy. (a) What are the options available to Ramesh as the Director of the Home Department of the bordering State? (b) What option should Ramesh adopt and why? (c) Critically evaluate each of the options. (d) What are the ethical dilemmas being faced by Ramesh? (e) What policy measures would you suggest to combat the menace of infiltration of illegal migrants from the neighbouring country?**

UPSC Civil Services Mains 2022 · GS IV · 20 marks · Ethics Case Studies

Case Studies on above issues.

### Core demand of the question

- Ramesh, Director in the Home Department of a border State, finds infiltration with connivance of security staff and forged Aadhaar, ration and voter cards. The Additional Home Secretary tells him to withdraw the report or lose the capital posting and promotion
- (a) Options
- (b) Which to adopt and why
- (c) Critically evaluate each option
- (d) Dilemmas
- (e) Policy measures against infiltration

### Revision summary

Ramesh's report names infiltration, conniving security staff and forged Aadhaar, ration and voter cards.

Withdrawing or diluting it is concealment; a partisan leak and empty resignation also fail.

The right option is written refusal, secured copies, lawful channels, and humane statutory process for those caught.

Dilemmas include family care versus integrity, and security versus cruelty.

Policy needs clean border posts, document integrity, evidence-based forums and protection of the reporting officer.

### Introduction

Ramesh has a cancer-ward mother, children in a good school, and a report that names infiltration and forged identity documents. The instruction is to withdraw the truth. Covering infiltration is not an option. Humane process for the twelve people caught is still required.

### Body

#### Stakeholders

- Ramesh, his mother in cancer care, and his adolescent children.
- The twelve persons caught at the border and any others in the settlement named in the report.
- Border security personnel alleged to have connived.
- Residents of the State whose rolls, rations and security are affected by forged Aadhaar, ration and voter cards.
- The Additional Home Secretary and the political executive.
- Intelligence sources who trusted him with a confidential report.

#### (a) Options

- **Option 1:** Withdraw the report, destroy copies, and stay in the capital.
- **Option 2:** Quietly dilute the report into a vague "border management note" that names no connivance and no forgery.
- **Option 3:** Leak the full report to the press or a party office while still in the chair.
- **Option 4:** Resign at once and leave the file behind.

- **Option 5:** Refuse withdrawal in writing, keep copies, send the report up and sideways to the competent statutory and intelligence channels, recuse from any cover-up meeting, and ensure the twelve persons are processed by law, not by a mob.

### (b) Option to adopt and why

- Adopt Option 5.
- Infiltration with forged Aadhaar, ration and voter cards is a crime against the roll, the treasury and, in a border State, against security. Withdrawing the report is participation in that crime.
- Written refusal creates a record that can protect him later better than a whispered no.
- **Humane lawful path:** the twelve persons are entitled to identification, hearing, and the procedure that the Foreigners Act, 1946 and related rules require - not a beating, not a secret camp, and not a quiet release arranged by the same nexus.
- Family hardship is real. It does not authorise a false withdrawal. Seek a lawful medical and posting representation after the file is safe, not as a bargain for silence.

### (c) Critical evaluation of each option

- **Option 1 merit:** mother remains near the hospital; promotion may survive.
- **Option 1 demerit:** concealment of infiltration and forgery; you become part of the connivance you caught; the next batch walks in on your silence.
- **Option 2 merit:** looks like a compromise.
- **Option 2 demerit:** a diluted note is still a lie of omission; conniving staff stay at the post.
- **Option 3 merit:** public heat.
- **Option 3 demerit:** sources burned, trial by media, possible Official Secrets and service-rule breaches, and the twelve families turned into a communal spectacle.
- **Option 4 merit:** clean hands in a personal sense.
- **Option 4 demerit:** the report may be buried the day you leave; resignation without securing the file is abandonment, not courage.
- **Option 5 merit:** truth preserved, lawful process, deterrence at the post.
- **Option 5 demerit:** transfer and delayed promotion are likely; that is the cost of the oath, not proof that the option is wrong.

### (d) Ethical dilemmas

- Integrity of the report versus the mother's cancer treatment and the children's schooling in the capital.
- Loyalty to a superior's oral order versus loyalty to the Constitution and to residents on the electoral roll.
- Confidentiality of intelligence versus the public's right not to live with a forged franchise.
- Security of the State versus humane treatment of the twelve persons who may include children.
- Career and promotion versus complicity in infiltration.
- The dilemma is not "kindness versus law". Kindness that hides forged voter cards is not kindness to the citizen already on the roll.

### (e) Policy measures against infiltration

- **Border force integrity:** rotation, camera and biometric attendance at posts, and independent surprise checks that a Director cannot be ordered to un-see.

- Fast, lawful inquiry against conniving personnel under service and criminal law, including the **Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988** where bribery is made out.
- **Identity-document hygiene:** Aadhaar, ration and voter databases must talk to each other on duplicates and impossible demographics, with a human appeal so that a genuine poor citizen is not struck off as collateral.
- Foreigners tribunals or equivalent statutory forums that decide presence with evidence, not with a crowd.
- Humane holding, legal aid, and child protection for families caught, while removal or regularisation follows the statute actually in force - not an oral political bargain.
- Intelligence-to-Home paper trail that cannot be withdrawn by one Additional Secretary without a written, reviewable reason.
- Community mapping that targets a racket, not a religion or a language as such.
- Witness protection for local informants and for officers like Ramesh who put a name on a page.

### Flow diagram

Infiltration and forged IDs -> Written refusal to withdraw  
Written refusal to withdraw -> Competent Home intelligence vigilance  
Written refusal to withdraw -> Lawful process for twelve persons  
Withdraw report -> Cover-up  
Party or press leak -> Spectacle and burned sources

### Conclusion

Withdrawing the report is a cover-up of infiltration and forgery. Ramesh should keep the file alive through written channels, process the twelve by law without cruelty, and accept that a posting may move. Policy must hit conniving posts and fake documents, not invent a humane-sounding silence.

### Facts & figures

#### Aadhaar, ration and voter cards

These are gateways to subsidy and franchise; forgery after infiltration is both a security and a democratic fraud.

#### Foreigners Act, 1946

The principal statute under which presence of a foreigner is regulated; process, not a mob, must decide a case.

#### Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988

Applies where public servants at a border post take a bribe to look away.

#### Whistle Blowers Protection Act, 2014

A Union frame for protected disclosure if Ramesh must report victimisation for a bona fide report on corruption.

**Conflict of interest**

The capital hospital and the children's school are private stakes; they must be named as pressure, not used as a reason to withdraw facts.

---

WRAP Exams · Write. Read. Analyse. Practice. · <https://wrapexams.com/upsc/mains-answers/gs-4/2022/case-study-ramesh-is-state-civil-services-officer-who-got-the-opportunity-of-getting-posted-to-the-capital-of-a-border-state-after-rendering-20-years-of-service-rameshs-mother-has-recently-been-detected-cancer-and-has/> · [ask@wrapexams.com](mailto:ask@wrapexams.com) · [wrapexams.com](https://wrapexams.com)

WRAP Exams