

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

Letters Patent Appeal No. 1819-2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 23.10.2019

Indresh Pratap Singh and others

.....Appellants

versus

State Bank of India and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAVI SHANKER JHA, CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SHARMA, JUDGE**

Present : Mr. Arun Bansal, Advocate, for the appellants.

RAVI SHANKER JHA, CHIEF JUSTICE (oral)

This appeal has been filed by the appellants being aggrieved by the order dated 06.09.2016 passed in Civil Writ Petition No. 9646-2014 dismissing the petition filed by the petitioners claiming absorption and permanent appointment in the establishment of the respondents.

Learned Single Judge taking into consideration the provisions of the law, the decision taken by the respondents after considering all aspects and rejecting the claim of absorption as well as the law of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in series of judgments had dismissed the petition holding that the petitioners have no right to claim absorption and that the claim for being absorbed on a particular post with all benefits cannot be permitted.

We do not find any illegality or infirmity in the impugned order warranting interference by us in the present appeal. The order passed by the learned Single Judge is accordingly affirmed and confirmed. It is, however, informed by learned counsel appearing for the appellants that subsequent to the decision of the learned Single Judge, the situation has changed on

account of merger of several banks. In case, the situation is changed and some other provisions have been brought out with respect to the employees like the petitioners, the petitioners would be at liberty to move a representation before the authorities for consideration of their case. It is, however, made clear that we have not expressed anything on the rights or claim of the petitioners in this regard and the authorities would be at liberty to examine it on all facts and circumstances of the case and thereafter take a decision to either accept or reject it.

With these observations, the appeal stands dismissed.

Since the main appeal itself has been dismissed, no orders are required to be passed in CM No.3732-2016 for adducing additional evidence.

(RAVI SHANKER JHA)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(RAJIV SHARMA)
JUDGE

23.10.2019
ravinder sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	√Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No√