

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4661 of 2025

=====

Ranjan Kumar Son of Dilip Prasad @ Dilip Kumar Resident of village-
Ghatkan, Police Station- Kako, District- Jehanabad.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Punjab National Bank through its the General Manager, in the Punjab National Bank, Personal Administrative Division, HO- 7, Bhikaiji Cama Place, New Delhi- 110607.
2. The Deputy General Manager, Punjab National Bank, New Delhi Head Office.
3. The Zonal Manager, Punjab National Bank, Zonal Office, Second Floor, Chanakya Tower, R. Block, Patna- 800001.
4. The Chief Manager, Punjab National Bank, Circle Office, Gaya.
5. The Lead District Manager, Punjab National Bank, Jehanabad.
6. The Manager/Officer Incharge, Punjab National Bank, Jehanabad.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anil Kumar, Advocate

For the Respondent 1 to 6: Mr. Suryakant Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 28-03-2025 After hearing the counsel for the petitioner and the respondent-Punjab National Bank, this writ application is being disposed of at this stage on the ground of the reasons stated herein.

2. In the present writ application, the petitioner has challenged the order dated 18.01.2021 (Annexure-P-9) by which the petitioner claims that his application for compassionate appointment was rejected.

3. The counsel for the respondents-bank points out



that the letter dated 18.01.2021 (Annexure-P-9) is not an order rejecting the application of the petitioner claiming compassionate appointment and in fact, it is the letter by which the respondent-bank has communicated to the petitioner that his application for compassionate appointment has been rejected vide letter / order dated 11.01.2021 and the said order of rejection dated 11.01.2021 has not been challenged by the petitioner in the present writ application. The counsel for the respondent Bank further submits that this fact was again communicated to the petitioner vide communication dated 09.08.2023 (Annexure-P-10) but even then the petitioner did not choose to challenge the actual order of rejection dated 11.01.2021.

4. On careful consideration of the submissions made by the parties and on perusal of Annexure-P-9, as well as Annexure P-10, this Court is of the view that the petitioner has failed to challenge the order by which his application for compassionate appointment was rejected, i.e., the order dated 11.01.2021 and instead thereof he has incorrectly or wrongly challenged the communication dated 18.01.2021(Annexure-P-9) which is not the order of rejection.

5. In view of the above, it is evident that the present



writ application is not maintainable for the reasons that the petitioner has failed to challenge the order of rejection of his application for compassionate appointment contained in letter dated 11.01.2021.

6. Hence, the present writ application is dismissed giving liberty to the petitioner to challenge the order of rejection of his claim for compassionate appointment contained in letter dated 11.01.2021 but if the petitioner decides to challenge the same, petitioner will have to explain as to why he slept over the matter for more than 4 years. The maintainability of the writ petition on the ground of delay and laches will be open for consideration.

7. With the aforesaid observation, this writ application stands dismissed.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

sanjeev/-

U			
---	--	--	--

