

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE: CHHATTISGARH: BILASPUR

Writ Petition No. 2030 / 2001

PETITIONER

: P. Mufli Mohan Rao,
aged about 38 years,
S/o Madan Mohan Rao
at present working as
Assistant Manager, State
Bank of India, Main-Branch,
Bilaspur (Chhattisgarh)

P.R. No. 195/
Presented by Vishnu Kosta
dated 20/9/2001

Versus

RESPONDENTS

- : 1. The General Manager,
Departmental and Personal
Banking (Appellate Authority),
State Bank of India, Local
Head Office, Bhopal (M.P.)
2. The Dy. General Manager,
(Disciplinary Authority),
State Bank of India,
Regional Office, Bilaspur
(Chhattisgarh)



WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLES 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION
OF INDIA.

54

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

SB: HON'BLE SHRI NAVIN SINHA, ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

Writ Petition No. 2030/2001

PETITIONER

P. Murli Mohan Rao

Versus

RESPONDENTS

The General Manager and
another

**WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF
INDIA**

Appearance :

Shri Vishnu Koshta, Advocate for the Petitioner.
Shri B.D.Guru, Advocate for the Respondents.

ORDER
(24.12.2014)

NAVIN SINHA, ACTING C.J.

सत्यमेव जयते

1. Heard Learned Counsel for the Petitioner and the Respondents.
2. Pursuant to a memo of charge the Petitioner was subjected to departmental proceedings. The Inquiry Officer exonerated him by report dated 6.6.1999. A second show cause notice for a difference of opinion was given to him on 12.6.1999. He submitted his reply on 17.6.1999. Punishment of Censure was then passed.
3. Learned Counsel for the Petitioner submits that while Departmental Proceedings were pending the Petitioner was considered for promotion to the post of Scale-II which was kept in sealed cover.

The tenure of censure has expired and directions may be given to open the sealed cover.

4. The Court does not find any infirmity in the Departmental Proceedings for the manner in which the Respondents have proceeded by giving a second show cause for a difference of opinion and then ordered censure.

5. The Petitioner is stated to have filed appeal against the same also unsuccessfully. The order of punishment warrants no interference.

6. Learned Counsel for the Respondents submits that if the period of censure has expired and his case for promotion was kept in sealed cover, it may be directed to be opened subject to any other issues and/or proceedings that may be pending or in which orders may have been passed.

7. The writ application सत्यमेव जयते is disposed in terms of the last submission made on behalf of the Respondents.

Sd/-
Ag. Chief Justice