$~82

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

\+ W.P.(C) 17777/2025

MOHAR SINGH GAUTAM .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rupesh Kumar Shahi, Mr. Nikhil Anand, Mr. Rajeev Basista, Mr. Shobhit Anand, Mr. Vishant, Mr. Harshil Basiste and Mr. Priyanshu Jaiswal, Advs.

Versus

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

Through: Mr. Avinash Kumar, Mr. Abhishek Srivastava and Ms. Harshita Srivastava, Advs.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

O R D E R

% **26.11.2025**

1. This petition is filed seeking directions to the respondent bank to allow the petitioner to avail pension option under the Bank of Baroda Employees' (Pension) Regulations, 1995 (in short 1995 Regulations) in pursuance to the application dated 20.09.2010 filed by the petitioner.

2. The brief facts are that the petitioner retired on 31.03.2001 from Bank of Baroda under the voluntary retirement scheme. On 27.04.2010, there was a bipartite settlement between the Indian Banks' Association and United Forum of Bank Unions, providing one-time option to retired employees to

join the pension scheme under 1995 Regulations. The petitioner exercised the option and the respondent bank vide letter dated 10.12.2010 directed the petitioner to deposit a sum of Rs. 2,58,722/- as pension cost in a designated account. The petitioner failed to do so. A legal notice dated 29.06.2016 was served upon the respondent bank. The legal notice was responded to vide communication dated 06.08.2016 and the request for joining the pension scheme at the belated stage was rejected for failure of the petitioner to deposit the pension cost.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that in compliance to letter dated 10.12.2010, the petitioner had to deposit a sum of Rs. 2,58,722/- on or before 12.12.2010 and the petitioner credited the amount in his account within the stipulated time and requested the bank to adjust the amount lying in the account of the petitioner towards the cost of pension but the needful was not done.

4. The contention raised by the learned counsel for the petitioner lacks merit. There is no document produced that petitioner requested the respondent bank to debit the amount of Rs. 2,58,722/- from the bank account of the petitioner.

5. Another angle to be considered is that the petitioner has been changing stands. In the legal notice served upon the respondents it was stated that the petitioner was not aware of the loan facility being provided by the respondent bank to the retired employees to enable them to pay Provident Fund on exercising the option. Whereas the case set up now is that the petitioner was having funds and these were lying in bank account but the bank failed to adjust the amount.

6. The grievance that only two day time was given to deposit the amount

cannot be gone into at this belated stage i.e. after more than fifteen years.

7. No case is made out for interference in the writ jurisdiction.

8. The petition is accordingly dismissed.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J

NOVEMBER 26, 2025/Pa