

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No 2515 of 2015

=====

Krishna Bihari Pandey Son of Sri Triveni Pandey Resident of Village - Bhaluahi,
P.O - Siyawank, P.S- Baghaila Distt- Rohtas.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Madhya Bihar Geramin Bank, through its Chairman, Head office Meena Plaza,
South of Museum Patna - 1
2. The Chairman-cum Disciplinary Authority, Madhya Bihar Gramin Bank, Head
office Meena Plaza, South of Museum Patna-1
3. The General Manager, Madhya Bihar Garmin Bank, Head offcer Meena Plaza,
South of Museum, Patna - 1

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr Bijay Shankar Choubey, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr Mahesh Narayan Parbat, Sr Advocate with
Mr Ved Prakash Srivastva, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE MADHURESH PRASAD

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 16-07-2018

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the
respondent-State.

2 Petitioner's counsel submits that even upon remand by
this Court under order dated 28.02.2014 passed in *CWJC No 3950 of
2013*, the Appellate Authority has passed the order without
considering the issues raised by the petitioner as also without
considering the fact that the quantum of punishment, being dismissal
from service, was grossly disproportionate to the allegations since, as
per the petitioner's submission, all the allegations, at best, constitute
irregularities or were mistakes committed under pressure of work



load.

3 This Court has gone through the order passed by the Appellate Board communicated on 28.08.2014. The same is a thorough and detailed order taking into consideration all the issues raised in his appeal. Regarding quantum of punishment, no issue has been raised in his appeal. Other charges were alleging repeated discrepancy in the totalling of cash book, improper maintenance of loan application and application disposal register, loan document register as also irregularities committed in the matter of disbursement of loan under KCC (JLG) Scheme even though there was specific restriction imposed upon the petitioner with respect to disbursement of loan. The findings are with reference to all the charges and respective points raised by the petitioner. The order of the Appellate Board is a detailed and considered order.

4 Prior to the order passed by the Appellate Board, petitioner has been afforded an opportunity in the proceedings after issuing a charge memo to him. This Court does not find any infirmity in the procedure. Submission is only that the Appellate Board has not considered the various issues raised by him. Since, consideration of the Appellate Board appears to be sufficient and with reference to all issues raised by the petitioner in his Memo of Appeal, which is Annexure 8 of the writ petition, this Court does not find any reason to



interfere with the order passed by the Appellate Board or the order of punishment.

5 The writ petition is devoid of merit and the same is dismissed.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J)

M.E.H./-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	18.07.2018
Transmission Date	NA

