

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Sr. No.118

Civil Writ Petition No. 24076 of 2017
DECIDED ON: October 25, 2017

UPKAR SINGH

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

PUNJAB AND SIND BANK AND OTHERS

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present: Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

JASPAL SINGH, J. (ORAL)

By virtue of the instant civil writ petition preferred under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, petitioner has sought the issuance of a writ especially in the nature of Certiorari quashing the order dated February 21, 2005 (P-17) passed by respondent No.3/appellate authority and order dated March 31, 2004 (P-15) passed by the Disciplinary Authority vide which the petitioner has been dismissed from the service in the light of the fact that on the same set of allegations, FIR No.51, dated May 02, 2002, Police Station Dina Nagar, Distt. Gurdaspur, FIR No.245 dated October 18, 2002, Police Station Sadar, Distt. Gurdaspur and FIR No.113 dated October 21, 2002, Police Station City Gurdaspur, were registered against the petitioner and in all the FIRs petitioner has been acquitted by the competent courts vide judgments P-18 to P-20 respectively.

Civil Writ Petition No. 24076 of 2017

--2--

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that though a legal notice dated September 27, 2016 (Annexure P-24) was moved to the respondents but till date, no action has been taken. He further submits that petitioner feels satisfied in case direction is given to respondents to decide the aforesaid legal notice, within a stipulated period.

3. Instant petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents to look into the grievances unfolded by the petitioner in his legal notice dated September 27, 2016 (Annexure P-24) and take a conscious decision by passing a speaking order as per rules and regulation of the Bank as well as judgement passed by this Court in CWP No.15586 of 2014 captioned as ***Parmanand vs. Syndicate Bank and another*** decided on July 15, 2016 in which version of the learned counsel for the petitioner has since been implemented by the respondents, within a period of four months from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order.

4. However, in case, petitioner still feels aggrieved of the order passed by concerned authority, he shall be at liberty to approach this Court.

October 25, 2017

Ankur

**(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE**

**Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable**

**Yes
Yes/No**