

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**SECOND APPEAL No.84 of 2016**

=====

Sri Niwas Singh, son of Late Sakaldip Singh, resident of village- Karisath,  
P.S.- Udwant Nagar, District- Bhojpur

... .. Appellant/s

Versus

1. State Bank of India,
2. The General Manager, State Bank of India, L.H.O. State Bank Building,  
Judges' Court Road, Patna- 800001
3. Assistant General Manager, Region- II, Zonal Office, State Bank of India,  
Frazer Road, Patna Post Bo x No.170, Patna- 800001

... .. Respondent/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Appellant/s : Mr. Gopal Govind Mishra, Advocate  
For the Respondent/s : None

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KHATIM REZA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      03-03-2025                      Heard learned counsel for the appellant.

2. This second appeal has been filed against the judgment and decree dated 30.01.2015 passed by the Additional District Judge, 5<sup>th</sup>, Danapur, Patna, in Money Appeal No.03 of 2012 (Trial No.01 of 2015) by which judgment and decree dated 09.05.2012 passed by the Sub Judge- 3<sup>rd</sup>, Danapur, Patna, in Money Suit No.04 of 2001 has been affirmed.

3. The plaintiff-appellant filed a suit for reward of rupees fifty thousand with interest as per the circular of the State Bank of India. The plaintiff-appellant, who was doing the job of Bank Guard, got injured on account of resisting a bank robbery putting his life to danger and further the defendant State Bank of



India be held accountable for treatment of the injury or any other complication of the plaintiff-appellant arising out of the injury caused in the incident. Further, the plaintiff-appellant be awarded interest at the rate of 18% *per annum* from the date of dues till the date of payment of compensation/reward amount.

4. Both the Courts below after examining the evidence and the materials available on record have held that the plaintiff-appellant had accepted rupees ten thousand as bravery reward. Entire expenses of the medical treatment of the plaintiff-appellant was borne by the State Bank of India as he had sustained gun shot injury while accompanying the cash of rupees two lakhs along with Bank's cashier during a *dacoity* on 08.10.1993. The appellate Court, who is the final Court of facts, has clearly held that vide Circular No.08 of 1992 dated 3<sup>rd</sup> April, 1992, issued by the Personnel Department, State Bank of India, a cash reward not exceeding rupees fifty thousand will be considered for the employees, who actively resisted bank robberies and terrorist attacks and the cash reward will be in addition to compensation to which a person may be entitled under the provisions of the Act. The cash reward will not exceed rupees fifty thousand and Respondent-Bank will consider for such employees, who actively resist bank robberies, but those



employees, who have to be considered by the Respondent-Bank, can not claim the quantum of award. The discretion of awarding reward money up to rupees fifty thousand lies in the hands of the Bank and the same cannot be claimed as a matter of right.

5. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case as well as the materials available on the record, it is quite apparent that the judgments and decrees of the Courts below are covered by the finding of facts and no question of law, much less, substantial question of law arises for consideration in this appeal.

6. In the result, this Second Appeal is dismissed at the stage of Order XLI Rule 11 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

**(Khatim Reza, J)**

J. Alam/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

