$~19

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

\+ W.P.(C) 5670/2025

MR SURESH KUMAR TUTEJA .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Puneet Jain, Sr. Adv. with Manit Moorjani, Mr. Om Sudhir Vidharthi, Ms. Shreya Maggu, Mr. Neeraj Keshav Jeph, Ms. Shradha Kashyap, Mr. Rohit Kumar Ray, Ms. Devika Samant, Mr. Tushar Sharma & Mr. Maan Arora, Advs.

versus

BANK OF BARODA & ORS. .....Respondents

Through: Ms. Praveena Gautam, Mr. Pawan Shukla, Ms. Tissy Annie Thomas & Mr. Rohan Bansla, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

O R D E R

% **27.05.2025**

CM APPL. 25924/2025 *(Exemption)*

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(C) 5670/2025

1. The petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking a direction upon the respondent – Bank of Baroda ["Bank"], to recompute the pension payable to him in terms of the 12th Bipartite Settlement dated 08.03.2024, entered into between the Indian Banks' Association and Workmen Union.

2. The petitioner's application for coverage under the Pension

Scheme dated notified *vide* circular dated 28.05.2024 ["Scheme"], was approved by the respondent – Bank, as evident from the email communication dated 02.01.2025 [Annexure P-19 to the writ petition].

3. However, even prior to the approval, the petitioner was informed by a letter dated 28.10.2024 that his application had been found in order. He was directed to refund the amount disbursed to him by way of the Bank's contribution to the Provident Fund, which he complied with. Thereafter, the petitioner disputed the computation of pension in terms of Scheme and addressed a detailed representation to the Bank on 02.12.2024 [Annexure P-17 to the writ petition] raising four issues with respect to the said computation.

4. From the record, it appears the Bank has not expressly addressed the issues raised by the petitioner. Nevertheless, the pension continues to be disbursed at the originally determined rate, which the petitioner has already challenged through his aforementioned representation.

5. In these circumstances, and having regard to the fact that the petitioner's representation raises issues involving several elements of re-computation, I am of the view that it would be appropriate for the said representation to be considered by the Bank, rather than for the matter to be adjudicated by the writ Court at the first instance.

6. The writ petition is, therefore, disposed of with the direction that the petitioner's representation dated 02.12.2024 be considered by the Bank within a period of eight weeks from today. Should the Bank require any further clarifications or documents from the petitioner, it may call for the same.

7. If upon consideration, the Bank concludes that the petitioner's

pension requires re-computation on any or all of the grounds raised in the said representation, it will carry out the necessary computation and remit the arrears to the petitioner within two months thereafter.

8. If, however, the Bank comes to a conclusion that any of the grounds raised by the petitioner are untenable, it will communicate the reasons for its decision to the petitioner within a period of eight weeks from today.

9. All rights and remedies of the parties remain reserved.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MAY 27, 2025
ab/pv/SD/