

\$~4

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 4490/2016 & CM No.18706/2016**

S.K. BALI

..... Petitioner

Through : Mr. Samundra Sain, Advocate

versus

PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK & ORS

..... Respondents

Through : Mr. Jagat Arora and
Mr. Rajat Arora, Advocates

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE HIMA KOHLI

ORDER

%

01.06.2016

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner praying *inter alia* for quashing the charge sheet dated 7.2.2013 issued by the respondent/Bank.
2. Mr. Arora, learned counsel for the respondent/Bank, who appears on advance notice, states that pursuant to issuance of the chargesheet dated 7.2.2013 to the petitioner, inquiry proceedings were conducted against him, which had concluded vide order dated 26.11.2013, passed by the Disciplinary Authority, whereunder the petitioner was imposed a major penalty. He submits that for reasons best known to the petitioner, he has not filed an appeal against the said order and instead, has filed the present misconceived petition laying a challenge to the chargesheet. He states that the remedy of filing an appeal against the order dated 27.11.2013 passed by the Disciplinary Authority is still available with the petitioner and the question of his assailing the chargesheet, which has culminated in the

Inquiry Report and duly acted upon by the Disciplinary Authority, does not arise.

3. At this stage, counsel for the petitioner states that he may be permitted to withdraw the present petition, while reserving the right of the petitioner to file an appeal before the Appellate Authority against the order dated 27.11.2013, passed by the Disciplinary Authority.

4. Leave, as prayed for, is granted. At the time of filing the appeal, the petitioner shall have to furnish a justification for the delay, which shall be duly considered by the Appellate Authority and a speaking order passed thereon.

5. The writ petition is disposed of, along with the pending application.

HIMA KOHLI, J

JUNE 01, 2016

sk