



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

216

CWP-561-2000
Date of decision:26.09.2024

G.R.NAGAR	Petitioner
Versus	
PUNJAB NATIONAL BANK AND OTHERS	...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK JAIN

Present : Mr. Mohit Saini, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. G.S. Bajwa, Advocate
for the respondents (Through VC).

Mr. Saurav Verma, Advocate and
Ms. Preeti, Advocate for the respondents.

ALOK JAIN. J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed *inter alia* seeking issuance of a writ of mandamus, directing the respondents to grant retrospective benefits, as the petitioner was deprived of the right to appear in the written test/selection for promotion in JMGS-I.
2. Written statement dated 20.04.2000 filed by Mr. G.S. Bajwa, Advocate on behalf of respondents No.1 to 4 is already on record, however, Mr. Saurav Verma Advocate has also filed the written statement on the same line on 27.08.2024 and the same was also taken on record.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was working as a Head Cashier with the respondent-Bank and had applied for leave to



appear in the departmental examination, which was to be conducted on 23.05.1993. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that since the roll number of the petitioner was detained by respondent No. 3, therefore, he could not appear in that examination and the persons who were junior to the petitioner had appeared in the said examination and were promoted. Learned counsel for the petitioner also submits that thereafter the petitioner submitted a representation for being promoted from the date when his juniors were promoted but the same was also not considered, hence the present writ petition.

4. Learned counsel for the respondent-Bank has submitted that the issue now being raised was also agitated by the petitioner before the learned Labour Court way back in the year 1993-1994 and by virtue of Annexure R-2 a settlement was arrived at between the petitioner and the respondent-bank, which clearly puts an estoppel against the petitioner to raise any dispute or claim *qua* the above issue, as he was reasonably compensated, at that stage itself and the petitioner never challenged the said order.

5. In light of the above, the present petition is devoid of any merit and accordingly the same is dismissed.

26.09.2024
amandeep/parul

(ALOK JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned.	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable.	:	Yes/No