

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

119

CWP-410-2023(O&M)

Date of Decision:26.04.2023

Chairman, Sarva Haryana Gramin Bank & another Petitioners

Versus

Permanent Lok Adalat and another Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.

**Present: Mr. Bhushan Bhatia, Advocate,
for the petitioners.**

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ , J.(Oral)

The Sarva Haryana Gramin Bank had raised a challenge to the award dated 30.09.2022 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Permanent Lok Adalat (Public Utility Services) Camp Court, Narnaul vide which Permanent Lok Adalat had directed the petitioners-bank to refund the amount of Rs.2,19,688/- to respondent No.2 along with interest @ 6% per annum from 08.12.2011 till its realization and for payment of compensation towards harassment.

The initial contention of the petitioners was that the receipt of FD had never been issued by the Bank and that the amount having not been received, the Certificate of FD issued in favour of the respondent No.2-consumer cannot be relied upon and has been wrongly given credit by the Permanent Lok Adalat.

A pointed query was posed to the learned counsel for the petitioners-Bank as to whether any departmental proceedings had been

initiated against the employees of the Bank for the alleged lapse.

Pursuant to the aforesaid query, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners-Bank has placed on record the departmental proceedings that were initiated against the employees concerned. He fairly concedes that the charge-sheet was never issued and in response to the charge, reply submitted by the delinquent employee was accepted and the proceedings were dropped. He thus concedes that the charge of the FD Certificate not having been issued by the officials of the Bank was thus dropped against the concerned employees.

Being faced with the fact that the officials of the petitioners-Bank nowhere acknowledged that there was a mistake on the part of the Bank and that the issuance of the Certificate of FD was thus returned to be proper, it cannot at this juncture be accepted that the deposit had not been made by the respondent No.2-applicant.

Faced with the above, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners thus seeks withdrawal of the present petition.

Disposed of as withdrawn.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

April 26, 2023
seema

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No