

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE A.M.SHAFFIQUE

FRIDAY, THE 20TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2015/1ST PHALGUNA, 1936

RP.No. 112 of 2015 (O) IN OP(LC).1109/2011

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN OP(LC) 1109/2011 of HIGH COURT OF
KERALA DATED 29-11-2013

REVIEW PETITIONER(S)/PETITIONER:

R.AJAY NAIR, AGED 47 YEARS
S/O.N.RAMAKRISHNAN NAIR, KAMALALAYAM,
KIZHUVALAM. P.O.
ATTINGAL - 695 104.

BY ADV. SRI.C.UNNIKRISHNAN (KOLLAM)

RESPONDENT(S)/RESPONDENTS:

1. STATE BANK OF TRAVANCORE
REPRESENTED BY ITS MANAGING DIRECTOR, HEAD OFFICE
POOJAPPURA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, PIN - 695 012.

2. THE DEPUTY GENERAL MANAGER
(APPELLATE AUTHORITY), DGM'S SECRETARIAT,
ZONAL OFFICE, STATE BANK OF TRAVANCORE,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

3. THE ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER
(DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY), STATE BANK OF TRAVANCORE
REGION III, ZONAL OFFICE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY SRI.P.RAMAKRISHNAN

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 20-02-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE
FOLLOWING:

A.M. SHAFFIQUE, J.

.....

R.P. No. 112 of 2015
in
O.P. (LC) No. 1109 of 2011

.....

Dated this the 20th day of February, 2015

ORDER

Petitioner has approached this Court seeking review of the judgment dated 29-11-2014. It is inter alia contended that this Court did not consider Exts. P18 and P19 wherein different views have been taken by the Bank with reference to certain other employees from whom also deficit of cash was noticed. It is also argued that it was not a case of misappropriation and there is no material to indicate that the petitioner was involved in misappropriation of any amount.

2. A perusal of the judgment impugned indicates that the entire issue has been considered by this Court including the

question as to whether this Court should interfere with the punishment imposed against the petitioner. Apparently, Exts. P18 and P19 were with reference to certain other employees in the Bank, the facts of which could not be borne out from the said documents. That was the reason for not referring to Exts. P18 and P19 which were treated to be irrelevant for consideration in the case. In the said circumstances, I do not think that any of the grounds mentioned by the petitioner warrants review of the judgment as there is no error apparent on the face of record. Accordingly this Review Petition is dismissed.

Sd/- A.M. SHAFFIQUE
(Judge)

ani/

/true copy/

P.S. to Judge

R.P. No. 112 of 2015
in O.P.(LC) No. 1109 of 2011