

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CWP No.13234 of 2015 (O/M)
Date of decision : 26.10.2016

S.C. Pathak

..... Petitioner (s)

Versus

Punjab National Bank and others

..... Respondent (s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDIP SINGH

Present:- Mr. B.B. Bagga, Advocate, for the petitioner.

Mr. Saurav Verma, Advocate, for respondents.

1. Whether the Reporters of local newspaper may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not.
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the digest ?

:-

:-

KULDIP SINGH J. (ORAL)

The petitioner, who was working as a Chief Manager in Punjab National Bank, was chargesheeted for his acts and omissions, while he was posted in Delhi. The perusal of the chargesheet (Annexure-P-5) shows that there are as many as eight heads of chargesheet and in each head, different acts and omissions have been mentioned. On the basis of said chargesheet, an enquiry was conducted and the petitioner was held guilty and finally removed from the service.

After going through the file, I am of the view that to properly appreciate the averments made in the present writ petition, the evidence is required to be led and the evidence and the documents are required to be appreciated. The same are also required to decide whether the quantum of punishment is disproportionate or not.

In these circumstances, it is not a fit case where the writ

CWP No.13234 of 2015 (O/M)

jurisdiction should be invoked. Hence, the petitioner is relegated to avail the remedy before the Civil Court by filing appropriate civil suit. However, if the civil suit is filed, the period during which the present writ petition remained pending before this Court, shall be excluded while computing the limitation.

Disposed of.

(KULDIP SINGH)
JUDGE

26.10.2016
sjks

Whether speaking / reasoned : Yes

Whether Reportable : No