

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

WRIT PETITION NO. 3847 OF 2025

Sneh Gaglani

... Petitioner

vs.

Bank of Maharashtra

... Respondent

...
Mrs.Preeti Bhushan Walimbe for the Petitioner.
Petitioner-in-person present.

...

**CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE &
ASHWIN D. BHOBE, JJ.**

DATE : NOVEMBER 25, 2025

P.C:

1. We had heard the Petitioner in person, yesterday. We have perused the office report submitted by the two learned Registrars of this Court, dated 26th September, 2025 wherein they have expressed the opinion that the Petitioner would not be able to assist the Court.

2. The Petitioner had appeared in person yesterday and, while addressing us, she became emotional and sentimental within a minute or two, and started weeping while addressing the Court. We, therefore, counseled her and convinced her that she needed the assistance of a lady

lawyer practicing in the field of service matters and having expertise in the said field. When she agreed to obtain such assistance, we requested the learned Advocate, Mrs. Preeti Walimbe, to assist the Petitioner. We also granted an adjournment yesterday, to enable the learned Advocate and the Petitioner to have proper interaction regarding this Petition.

3. Today, the Petitioner is present in person in the Court Hall and she confirms that learned Advocate, Mrs. Preeti Walimbe, will represent her in this litigation.

4. While considering this Petition, we noticed that the Petitioner has already preferred a Statutory Departmental Appeal on 1st March, 2025 before the Respondent-Bank. The same is pending, though it was lodged on 1st March, 2025. The Petitioner is unaware whether any decision has been delivered. The second aspect is that the Petitioner has also made a representation dated 28th December, 2024 and various reminders were filed for raising issues regarding her cash credit facility and allowances not being deposited into her account. She is also aggrieved that the cash credit facility account has now been converted into NPA.

5. Since the Statutory Departmental Appeal is pending, we do not deem it appropriate to entertain this Petition. As an innocuous prayer for an early decision has been made, we do not find it necessary to issue notice to the Respondent-Bank, as no specific order is being passed against it. The same approach applies in respect of her representation dated 1st February, 2021 and the connected representations.

6. In view of the above, **this Petition is disposed off** with the following directions:

(a) The Respondent shall decide the Departmental Appeal dated 1st March 2025, filed by the Petitioner challenging the final punishment awarded to her pursuant to the departmental inquiry. If the Rules permit, the Bank shall issue notice to the Petitioner, calling upon her to remain present before the Appellate Authority at Pune and to participate in the hearing on such dates as the appeal may be posted. Since the head office of the Bank is in Pune, the Petitioner would be at liberty to either travel for the hearing or address the Appellate Authority through video conferencing;

(b) After completion of the above exercise strictly in

accordance with the Rules, we expect the Bank to deliver a reasoned order within 30 days from the date of completion of the hearing in the appeal. For the above exercise, we grant 45 days' time for completing the hearing and 30 days' time thereafter for delivery of the reasoned order;

(c) The reasoned order would be communicated to the Petitioner within 24 hours of its passing, on the following email address:

Email address : bankinggrowth@gmail.com

(d) Insofar as the representation dated 1st February, 2021 and connected representations are concerned, if they are yet to be decided, the Respondent-Bank shall consider and decide them by following the due procedure laid down in law, within 60 days from the date of service of this order on the Respondent-Bank, by Speed Post AD or on the email address of the Bank;

(e) A printout of this order obtained from the official website of the Bombay High Court would be served upon the Respondent-Bank by the Petitioner, by email or by Speed Post A.D;

(f) The above-mentioned timelines of 45 days, 30 days and 60 days, respectively would be reckoned from the date of service of this order on the Respondent-Bank.

(g) All grounds raised in the report as well as in the representations dated 1st February, 2021 and the connected representations, would be dealt with by the Respondent-Bank.

7. We record our appreciation for the gesture of learned Advocate Mrs. Walimbe in representing the Petitioner '*pro bono*' on the request of the Court.

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)