



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 12TH DAY OF JUNE, 2026

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN

AND

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIJAYKUMAR A. PATIL

REVIEW PETITION NO.546/2025

BETWEEN:

1. KAUSHIK KUNAL
AGED ABOUT 36 YEARS
S/O RAN VIJAY PANDEY
R/O. PANDEY KOTHI, YARPUR
GARDANIBAGH, ROAD NO.1
PATNA, BIHAR - 800 001.

...PETITIONER

(BY SRI. PAVAN V, ADV.,)

AND:

1. UNION OF INDIA
REP. BY DEPT. OF FINANCIAL SERVICE
MINISTRY OF FINANCE, 3RD FLOOR
JEEVAN DEEP BUILDING
SANSAD MARG, NEW DELHI.
2. KARNATAKA VIKAS GRAMEENA BANK
REP. BY CHAIRMAN, HEAD OFFICE
P.B. NO.111, BELGAUM ROAD
DHARWAD 580 008.
3. KAVERI GRAMEENA BANK
REP. BY CHAIRMAN, CA-20

Digitally signed
by RUPA V

Location: HIGH
COURT OF
KARNATAKA



VIJAYANAGAR 2ND STAGE
MYSURU - 570 017.

4. PRAGATHI KRISHNA GRAMEEN BANK
REP. BY CHAIRMAN, POST BOX NO.55
NO.32, SANGANKAL ROAD, GANDHINAGAR
BALLARI-583103.
5. INSTITUTE OF BANKING PERSONNEL SELECTION
REP. BY DIRECTOR, IBPS, IBPS HOUSE
90 FEET, D.P. ROAD, NEAR THAKUR
POLYTECHNIC, OFF. WESTERN EXPRESS HIGHWAY
P.B. NO.8587, KANDIVAL (E), MUMBAI 400 101
REP. BY THEIR AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY
MANOJ K. BISWAL.
6. AKASH SETHI
AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS
S/O ASHOK SETHI
RESIDENT OF 6-G-24
JAWAHAR NAGAR, SHRI GANGA NAGAR
RAJASTHAN 335 001.
7. JAYPRAVAS MISHRA
AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS
S/O HEMANTA KUMAR MISHRA
R/O. BRAHAMANBHUIIN
PO-KALARABANK, DIST-CUTTACK
ODISHA-754 132.
8. MANISH JANGIR
AGED ABOUT 27 YEARS
S/O SARDAR SINGH
R/O. WARD NO.2, PO - MAKRO
VILL. SINGHANA, DIST. JHUNJHUNU
RAJASTHAN 333 504.
9. SAJAN PUNYANI
AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS
S/O HARBANSHALALA PUNYANI
R/O INDIRA COLONY, GALI NO.9



WARD NO.42, DIST. SRIGANGANAGAR
RAJASTHAN - 335 004.

10. RAVI KUMAR
AGED ABOUT 23 YEARS
S/O BALDEV PRAKASH
R/O WARD NO.4, PO BOLANWALI
SANGARIA, DIST. HANUMANGARH
RAJASTHAN - 335 063.
11. KUNDAN KUMAR
AGED ABOUT 30 YEARS
S/O BALMIKI PARASAD SINGH
R/O. VILL. JHITKAHI, PO-PHULKAN
PS SHYAMPUR, BHATAN
DIST. SHEOHAR, BIHAR 843 329.
12. LOKANATH CHOUDHURY
AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS
S/O AWEDHESH KUMAR SHARMA
R/O. PLOT NO.1859, MAHATAB ROAD
ANANT NAGAR, OLD TOWN
BHUBHANESHWAR, DIST. KHURDA
ODISHA - 571 002.
13. SANWAR MAL JAT
AGED ABOUT 24 YEARS
S/O MADAN LAL
R/O. BAJROLI, MEERAN, SIKAR
RAJASTHAN - 332 312.
14. SUMAN SAURABH SHARMA
AGED ABOUT 28 YEARS
S/O AWADESH KUMAR SHARMA
R/O. KANHAULI KHADI, BHANDAR CHOWK
GANDHINAGAR, MUZAFFARPUR
BIHAR - 842 002.
15. DIPU PANDEY
S/O ASHUTOSH PANDEY
AGED ABOUT 29 YEARS



NC: 2026:KHC:28655-DB
R.P. No.546/2025

R/O. GABHIRAR
PS-RAGHUNATHPUR
DIST. SIWAN, BIHAR - 841 509.

16. VIJENDER KUMAR
S/O VINOD KUMAR
AGED ABOUT 26 YEARS
R/AT WARD NO. 7, PO-NUKERA
TEHSIL SANGARIA
DIST. HANUMANGARH
RAJASTHAN 335 063.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. HARSHA P. BANAD, ADV., FOR R1 (MA FILED))

- - -

THIS REVIEW PETITION IS FILED UNDER SECTION 114 R/W ORDER XLVII RULE 1 OF CPC 1908, PRAYING TO CALL FOR RECORDS IN WRIT APPEAL NO.647/2021 (S-RES) C/W WRIT APPEAL NO.735/2021 (S-RES) ON THE FILE OF THIS HON'BLE COURT. REVIEW THE ORDER DATED 06.03.2025 PASSED BY THIS HON'BLE COURT IN WRIT APPEAL NO.647/2021 (S-RES) C/W WRIT APPEAL NO.735/2021 (S-RES) (ANNEXURE A) AND CONSEQUENTLY DISMISS THE SAID WRIT APPEALS & ETC.

THIS PETITION, COMING ON FOR ORDERS, THIS DAY, JUDGMENT WAS DELIVERED THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN
and
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIJAYKUMAR A. PATIL



ORAL JUDGMENT

(PER: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANU SIVARAMAN)

This review petition is filed to review the judgment dated 06.03.2025 passed by this Court in W.A.No.6471/2021 (S-RES) connected with W.A.No.735/2021 (S-RES).

2. We have heard the learned counsel for the review petitioner at quite a length.

3. The Institute of Banking Personnel Selection ('IBPS') conducted Common Recruitment Process ('CRP') in the Regional Rural Banks ('RRB') for Officers and Office Assistants as RRB - VI under Notification dated 22.07.2017, which provided a reserve list valid for one year from provisional allotment "*or until a fresh provisional allotment is made, whichever is earlier.*" Allotment under RRB-VI was made on 01.02.2018. IBPS then issued a fresh notification, RRB-VII and made a fresh allotment on 01.01.2019. The review petitioner and RRB-VI reserve-list



candidates filed Writ Petition No.5317/2019 claiming the list was valid till 31.01.2019, that RRB-VII appointments were illegal and sought appointment against subsisting vacancies. The learned Single Judge allowed the writ petition on 16.04.2021, and held that though the reserve-list candidates have no indefeasible right to appointment, because vacancies were in existence, the list ought to have been operated and the petitioner should have been appointed from the list and directed the RRBs to consider the case of the writ petitioners and appoint eligible petitioners within three months.

4. In Writ Appeal Nos.647/2021 and 735/2021, the Division Bench held that the learned Single Judge had overlooked the words "whichever is earlier" and the fresh provisional allotment on 01.01.2019 automatically extinguished the RRB-VI reserve list on that date, before the one-year period expired. Since the writ petitioners approached this Court only on 29.01.2019, which was after the expiry of the reserve list, they had no subsisting



right. Therefore, the appeals were allowed and the judgment of the learned Single Judge was set aside on 06.03.2025.

5. The current review petition is filed seeking review of the Judgment on the ground that the candidates in the reserve list are to be recruited where vacancies are available from the allotment list, and the RRBs cannot arbitrarily ignore the reserve list and proceed to a fresh provisional allotment under RRB-VII. Though the RRBs of all other States made appointments from the RRB-VI reserve list, the Karnataka RRBs sought a fresh allotment instead. Further, the reserve list was not exhausted and RRB-VII could not have been conducted without exhausting the RRB-VI reserve list. It is contended that the review petitioner, whose right to appointment had crystallised was entitled to be appointed on a legitimate expectation, the RRBs' failure to act on the reserve list and forward the vacancies to IBPS is against the law and arbitrary.



6. It is contended that the writ appeals were allowed only on the ground that the review petitioner approached this Court belatedly, but all other findings of the learned Single Judge have attained finality. The non-consideration of the review petitioner's remaining contentions is an error apparent on the face of the record. Therefore, the review petitioner has filed the present review.

7. Learned counsel for the review petitioner referred to Annexure-E and contended that the review petitioner was entitled to be considered for selection as against the vacancies.

8. Learned counsel for the review petitioner has placed reliance on the following decisions:

- (1) ***BIRENDRA SINGH YADAV Vs. THE STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH & ORS.*¹**
- (2) ***JYOTI Vs. SARVA HARYANA GRAMIN BANK*²**
- (3) ***SARVA HARYANA GRAMIN BANK Vs. JYOTI*³**

¹ MANU/MP/4281/2024

² 2023:PHHC:166479



- (4) **SARVA HARYANA GRAMIN BANK Vs. PARAS KUMAR⁴**
- (5) **SARVA HARYANA GRAMIN BANK Vs. PARAS KUMAR⁵**
- (6) **MANOJ MANU & ORS. Vs. UNION OF INDIA (UOI) & ORS.⁶**
- (7) **G.MANJUNATHA & ORS. Vs. THE STATE OF KARNATAKA & ORS.⁷**

9. We have considered the contentions advanced. We notice that the entire factual aspects of the matter have been considered by this Court in the judgment under review. The validity of the reserved list as well as the conditions for making selections therefrom have been specifically referred in the judgment.

10. It is pertinent to note that the review petitioner preferred Special Leave Petitions (Civil) No.20775-20776/2025 before the Apex Court. By order dated 04.08.2025, the Apex Court permitted the review petitioner to withdraw the special leave petitions in view of

³ 2024:PHHC:12726-DB

⁴ 2024:PHHC:127255-DB

⁵ SLP (Civil) No.2096/2025

⁶ (2013) 12 SCC 171

⁷ W.P.Nos.52931-52936/2016



the document dated 09.05.2022, reserving liberty to file a review petition and further liberty to approach the Court should the need arise. The special leave petitions were accordingly dismissed as withdrawn.

11. The contention of the review petitioner is that the document dated 09.05.2022, which is a reply furnished under the Right to Information Act, 2005, by the Karnataka Vikas Grameena Bank disclosing that 163 posts remained vacant even after completion of the joining formalities, came to the knowledge of the review petitioner only after the judgment under review was passed, and that this Court ought to consider the said document.

12. We notice that the document relied on establishes the existence of vacancies. However, the finding of this Court in the writ appeal was that the reserve list could be operated subject to vacancies being reported within one year after the date of the provisional allotment. The notification specifically stated that the



reserve list will expire automatically on the date which is one year after the date of provisional allotment or until a fresh provisional allotment is made whichever is earlier with or without any notice. It was specifically found that a fresh provisional allotment was made on 01.01.2019. No additional vacancies were reported for filling up from the reserve list till 01.01.2019. Therefore, the list stood exhausted on that day. The writ petitions were filed on 29.01.2019 contending that the reserve list remains valid till 31.01.2019. This aspect was specifically considered and it was held in the judgment under review that the validity of the reserve list had expired on 01.01.2019 and the writ petition filed on 29.01.2019 could not therefore had been considered.

13. In the above factual situation, we are of the clear view that the contention that there were posts remaining vacant after the joining formalities will make absolutely no difference to the situation since the review petitioners, who were empanelled in the reserve list which



stood expired on 01.01.2019 could have no right to be considered as against those vacancies, even if they were in existence.

14. In the result, we are of the clear view that there is no patent error in the judgment which requires rectification under review. No good grounds to review the judgment have been made out.

15. Accordingly, the review petition fails and is dismissed.

All the pending interlocutory applications shall stand disposed of.

Sd/-
(ANU SIVARAMAN)
JUDGE

Sd/-
(VIJAYKUMAR A. PATIL)
JUDGE

RV
List No.: 1 Sl No.: 4