

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No. 3332 of 2021**

Anuj Kumar Tiru S/o Koushal Moy, Aged About 50 Years, Earlier Working As JMGS-I, State Bank Of India, CAC Raipur, Chhattisgarh, R/o Village Kalyanpur, Hatia Railway Colony, Hatia, P.S. Jagarnnathpur, Ranchi, Jharkhand

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Bank Of India Through Appointing Authority General Manager, Nework-1, Vigilance Department, L. H.O. Hoshangabad Road, Bhopal District Bhopal, M. P.
2. The Appellate Authority, Vigilance Department, L. H.O. Hoshangabad Road, Bhopal, District Bhopal, M. P.
3. State Bank Of India Through Deputy General Manager(Business And Operation), NW-3, Disciplinary Authority, Administrative Office, Byron Bazar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Raghvendra Pradhan, Advocate
For State	:	Mr. Ayaz Naved, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****07.07.2021**

1. The petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking for an appropriate direction to the respondents to consider and decide his representation that he had made on 18.01.2021 praying for reinstatement in service with consequential benefits.
2. The petitioner, in the present writ petition, was implicated in a criminal case for the offence punishable under Sections 467, 468, 471, 420 & 120B of IPC.

The said matter was put to trial before the Court of Judicial Magistrate First Class, Saraipali, District Mahasamund in Criminal Case No. 169/2014. The said criminal case finally got concluded and the petitioner was acquitted of all the charges levelled against him. Meanwhile, the petitioner was also subjected to a departmental inquiry and on the basis of the finding in the departmental inquiry, the service of the petitioner was terminated vide order dated 05.11.2011. Though the petitioner had preferred an appeal against the said order of termination in the year 2013, till date the appeal has not been decided as has been contended by the petitioner.

3. At this juncture, counsel for the petitioner wants that the respondents may consider and decide the representation Annexure P-1 which the petitioner has filed in the light of the judgment of acquittal that the petitioner has received in respect of the same nature of allegations for which the petitioner's services have been terminated.
4. Without expressing any opinion on the merits of the case so far as the claim of the petitioner is concerned, the writ petition at this juncture stands disposed of directing the respondents to consider and decide the representation of the petitioner Annexure P-1 on its own merits in accordance with law at the earliest preferably within a period of 90 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.
5. The writ petition accordingly stands disposed of.

Sd/-
P. Sam Koshy
Judge

Khatai