

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 7212 of 2010**

1. Parambeer Singh Bedi, S/o Shri Manmohan Singh, aged about 47 years, R/o B/18, Anandpuram, Near Milestone School, Junwani, Kohka Road, Bhilai, Distt. - Durg (C.G.)
2. Syed Zia Jafar, S/o Late S.S. Jafar, aged about 48 years, R/o HIG II/19, New Borsi Extn., Durg (C.G.)

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. Durgh Rajnandagaon Gramin Bank, Through its Chairman, Head Office, G.E. Road, Rajnandgaon (C.G.) - 491441
2. Union of India, Through Secretary, Ministry of Finance, New Delhi.

---- Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Shri Sunil Sahu, Advocate.
For Respondent No.1	:	Shri N. Naha Roy, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Ajay Kumar Tripathi, Chief Justice**Order on Board****28.02.2019**

1. Heard the learned counsel for the Petitioners and learned counsel for the Respondent No.1.
2. Annexure P/2 dated 19.08.2010, the so-called promotion policy issued by the Durg Rajnandgaon Gramin Bank has been assailed on the ground that the policy so notified is a contrary to the notification dated 13.07.2010 notified by the Ministry of Finance in exercise of power conferred by Section 29 of the Regional Rural Banks Act, 1976 read with Section 17 in supersession of the Regional Rural Banks (Appointment & Promotion of Officers & Other Employees) Rules, 1998.

3. The argument is sought to be built up that in matters of promotion, 50% of the vacancies for promotion shall be filled up on normal channel and 50% under fast track channel, however, such thing has not been provided in the Annexure P/2.
4. When the Court looked at what was being read out, it is found that such a provision is part of Schedule-III in relation to recruitment and promotion of Officers Junior Management Scale-I, but the said terms and conditions of recruitment and promotion to such post is being relied upon by the counsel to assail Annexure P/2 as an erroneous policy.
5. With due respect to the learned counsel, such provision is in relation to a particular post and the terms and conditions indicated therein cannot be picked out of context and applied across the board in all situations and for all posts.
6. The whole writ application therefore, is a misplaced effort on a wrong reading of the provisions and the notifications in question.
7. Writ has no merit. It is dismissed.

Sd/-

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi)
Chief Justice