



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

225

CWP-37570-2018
Date of decision: 30.07.2025

GEETA DEVIPetitioner

VERSUS

UCO BANK AND OTHERSRespondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: - Mr. Amarpreet Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Praveen Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Malika, Advocate for
Mr. C.S. Bakshi, Amicus Curiae.

Ms. Neetu Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Shekhar Verma, Advocate
for the respondent-UCO Bank.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (Oral)

Challenge in the present writ petition was to the order whereby punishment of stoppage of one increment without cumulative effect was imposed upon the petitioner. It is further reveals from the case file that notice of motion has not been issued so far in the matter even though a period of nearly 07 years elapsed. Vide order dated 21.12.2018, the following academic issue was framed for an adjudication before notice of motion is to be issued:

*“Before the notice of motion is issued in the
present case, the question which needs to be*



CWP-37570-2018

-2-

decided is as to whether, once an order of punishment had become final after the appeal filed by the petitioner was dismissed by the appellate authority, was there any jurisdiction with the National Commission for Scheduled Caste to entertain an application in respect of the said punishment and give directions to the appellate authority to reconsider the matter. It is only after this question is declared, this petition can be entertained in respect to the challenge raised by the petitioner to the impugned order.”

Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner contends that he has no further instructions in the matter. However noticing the minor punishment of stoppage of one increment had been imposed upon the petitioner and Counsel for the petitioner has made an affirmative statement that he has no further instruction to pursue the matter. It seems that the petitioner himself is not interested in contesting the order of punishment. The exercise to be undertaken on the question framed vide order dated 21.12.2018 would thus only be an academic exercise.

While keeping the said question open, the instant writ petition is dismissed for non-prosecution.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

JULY 30, 2025
Vishal Sharma

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