



**698 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**Date of Decision: 28.11.2025
LPA-1352-2019**

**SARV HARYANA GRAMIN BANK AND ANOTHER
... APPELLANTS
V/S
N S LAMBA
... RESPONDENT**

LPA-1671-2019

**M.K. SAXENA
... APPELLANT
V/S
SARVA HARYANA GRAMIN BANK AND ANOTHER
... RESPONDENTS**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present: Mr. Bhushan Bhatia, Advocate,
for the appellants in LPA-1352-2019 and
for the respondents in LPA-1671-2019.

Mr. Amit Parashar, Advocate,
for the respondent in LPA-1352-2019.

None for the appellant in LPA-1671-2019.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (ORAL)

These are two appeals. For the sake of convenience, the facts are being extracted from LPA-1352-2019.

Learned Single Judge had allowed two writ petitions. In respect of one of the writs, the LPA filed by the present appellant being LPA-1343-2019 has been decided on 27.10.2025.

We have observed as under in LPA-1343-2019:-

“6. Considering the aforesaid circumstances, we are of the view that once the respondent-petitioner has been allowed to work and thereafter superannuate, it would be inequitable at this stage to interfere with the judgment of the learned Single Judge and deny him the benefits, which have already been extended to him under the orders of the learned Single Judge.

7. We are also informed by the learned counsel for the appellants that all retrial benefits have been paid to the respondent-petitioner. This also is a ground which persuades us not to embark upon any exercise to adjudicate the legality of the decision of the learned Single Judge at this belated stage.

8. Consequently, this appeal is consigned to the records. Liberty, however, stands reserve to the respondent to point out any further dues, which may be due to him, in terms of the order of learned Single Judge, which shall be accorded consideration by the Bank within a period of two weeks.

9. Letters Patent Appeal stands **disposed of.**”

In the facts of the present case, the respondent had attained the age of superannuation by the time the writ petition was decided. The charge against the respondent-petitioner is similar to the one imposed upon M.K.Saxena, whose case has been decided in LPA-1343-2019. Just because the respondent had attained the age of superannuation and had not worked, the punishment imposed upon him would not be sustained, once the punishment for same charge has been modified in terms of the directions issued by the learned Single Judge.

In such circumstances, these appeals are also disposed of in terms of the order dated 27.10.2025 passed in LPA-1343-2019.

The respondent/petitioner shall be treated to have attained the age of superannuation on 28.02.2016. For the period he has not worked, no salary would be paid to him. However, he would be entitled to retiral benefits in terms of the order passed by the learned Single Judge. Such benefits would be released within a period of four weeks.

Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

28.11.2025
smriti

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

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