

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CWP-20644-2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision:-12.09.2017.

Mandeep Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State Bank of India and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI

Present: Mr. Shekhar Verma, Advocate for the petitioners.

P.B. BAJANTHRI, J. (Oral)

In the present petition, petitioners have sought for the following relief:-

- i) issue an appropriate, Writ, Order or direction especially in the nature of Mandamus, directing the respondents to allow the petitioners to continue working as BC/Bank Mitras on the same terms and conditions on which they were working with the erstwhile State Bank of Patiala, now merged with the respondent-State Bank of India, especially in view of the fact that the petitioners are being discriminated and the protection granted to the petitioners under clause 3, 4, 7, & 8 of the notification dated 22.2.2017, Annexure P-13, while effecting merger, is not being provided to the petitioners by the respondents in an illegal, arbitrary, discriminatory and unconstitutional manner in flagrant violation of Articles 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of*

India without any valid reason or justification;

ii) It is further prayed that the respondents may also kindly be directed to treat the petitioners at par with their counterparts i.e. BC/Bank Mitras of the respondent-State Bank of India and to grant all the facilities as are being extended to them and not to discriminate the petitioners in violation of their fundamental rights enshrined under Articles, 14, 16 and 21 of the Constitution of India as the petitioners, who were working with the erstwhile State Bank of Patiala now merged with the respondent-State Bank of India and thus upon merger, their services also stand transferred to the respondent-State Bank of India and the petitioners were and are still performing the same nature of duties and responsibilities as were being performed by them prior to the date of merger i.e. 01.04.2017;”

Petitioners have rushed to this Court without their being an appropriate demand before the competent authority. For the purpose of writ of mandamus or direction to the authorities, one must have demanded appropriate relief before the competent authority. Perusal of the representation do not tally with the prayer.

Therefore, writ petition is dismissed. Reserving liberty to the petitioners to make appropriate representation before the competent authority.

(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE

September 12, 2017.

sandeep

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Whether Reportable:-

Yes / No

Yes / No.