



\$~10

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 940/2005 & CM APPL. 5781/2022**

SURESH PURI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ravikesh Kumar Sinha, Advocate

versus

STATE BANK OF INDIA

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Buddy A. Ranganad and
Ms. Shefali Tripathi, Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

20.09.2024

%

1. Petitioner was an employee of State Bank of Travancore, an associate of the State Bank of India and had joined in May, 1981 as a Probationary Officer. Petitioner avers that on account of his dedicated and exemplary service, he was given coveted postings and also promoted as a Scale-III Officer *albeit* belatedly. Petitioner achieved unprecedented growth for the Bank by canvassing deposits from NRIs between May, 1995 to June, 1997 and took several initiatives to computerize the Branch he was working in. There was a record recovery of accounts rendered NPA etc. in his tenure. Despite this, Petitioner was denied promotion as a Scale-IV Officer between 1998 to 2000 despite being eligible and in the zone of consideration. Petitioner preferred appeals during this period but there was no response. Petitioner avers that in 2001 there was a change in policy with respect to awarding marks for assessment of five years performance appraisal and Petitioner was hopeful that he will be given promotion after the change in policy, however, the Petitioner was not even included in the zone of



consideration and aggrieved by this, he again preferred appeals before the Competent Authority between 2001 to 2004 but the same were not even decided and are pending till date.

2. At the outset, learned counsel for Petitioner, on instructions, from the Petitioner who is present in Court, submits that Petitioner has preferred 4 appeals dated 18.12.2001, 02.12.2002, 03.11.2004 and 26.11.2005 aggrieved by his non-inclusion in the zone of consideration for promotion as Scale-IV Officer and direction be issued to the Respondent to dispose the said appeals.

3. Learned counsel for the Respondent, *per contra* submits that all the pending appeals have been disposed of and intimation to this effect was posted on the notice board of the Bank at the relevant time.

4. At this stage, Petitioner seeks a limited relief of a direction to the Respondent to dispose of his pending appeals dated 18.12.2001, 02.12.2002, 03.11.2004 and 26.11.2005. *Albeit*, counsel for the Respondent submits that appeals were disposed of and intimation to this effect was posted on the notice board, in my view, this is not the correct method to dispose of the appeals/representations of employees and the least Respondent should have done was to have passed an order and communicated the same to the Petitioner, which path has not been followed. Therefore, without entering into the merits of the case, this writ petition is disposed of directing the Respondent to decide the appeals dated 18.12.2001, 02.12.2002, 03.11.2004 and 26.11.2005, preferred by the Petitioner within a period of 08 weeks from the date of receipt of this order. In case the Respondent finds merit in the contentions of the Petitioner and the legal issues flagged by him, consequential benefits shall be granted to him. In case, for any reasons, the



decision is otherwise, a reasoned and speaking order shall be passed which will be communicated to the Petitioner within a week from the date of the decision and Petitioner will be at liberty to take recourse to legal remedies, if so advised.

5. Pending application also stands disposed of.

JYOTI SINGH, J

SEPTEMBER 20, 2024

DV