

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.4163 of 2026

=====

Rajendra Prasad Son of Late Ram Sinhashan Singh, Resident of Barka Nuwan, Buxar, Bihar Pin code - 812102.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Punjab National Bank through the Chief General Manager, Head Office, HRD Plot No.4, Sector 10, Dwarka, New Delhi- 110075.
2. The Zonal Manager, Punjab National Bank, Zonal Office, Chanakya Tower, Patna.
3. The Circle Head, Ara Circle, Punjab National Bank, Ara.
4. The Assistant General Manager, Punjab National Bank, Head Office, Disciplinary Action Cell (Workmen)

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Rohit Mishra, Advocate
For the Respondent/s	:	Mr.Suresh Pd Singh No.1, Advocate
		Mr. Aditya Raj, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL JUDGMENT
Date : 24-03-2026

Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned Counsel for the Punjab National Bank.

2. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a retired employee of Punjab National Bank, who retired in the month of March, 2024, but after his retirement a charge memo has been issued on 11.12.2025. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that after retirement the relation between the employer and the employee has ended and, therefore, there is no question of initiation of charge after



retirement. Counsel submits that in the said charge memo the provision of PNB (Employees') Pension Regulations 1995 has been discussed. Counsel submits that he has annexed the extract of the said provision, i.e., the PNB (Employees') Pension Regulations 1995. According to Clause 48(2) no departmental proceeding could be initiated after retirement. He also submits that earlier charge memo was issued vide Annexure-P/1 dated 28.03.2024 by the Circle Head, which was ended and nothing was found against the present petitioner. Counsel submits that on the same fact issuance of another charge memo is bad-in-law.

3. Learned Counsel for the Bank submits that the said Annexure-P/16 does not make issuance of charge absolute bar. The question of absolute bar shall arise only after lapse of four years from the date of event.

4. Upon hearing the parties and perusal of the said relevant provision, it transpires to this Court that Regulation 48(2) of the PNB (Employees') Pension Regulations 1995 states as follows:

“48(2) No departmental proceedings, if not instituted while the employee was in service, shall be instituted in respect of an event which took place more



than four years before such institutions.

Provided that the disciplinary proceedings so instituted shall be in accordance with the procedure applicable to disciplinary proceedings in relation to the employee during the period of his service.”

5. It transpires to this Court that petitioner has retired in the month of March, 2024 and from his retirement four year has not lapsed. In the meantime, the charge memo has been issued. Hence, this Court is not inclined to interfere in the said charge memo. Petitioner is directed to participate in the departmental proceeding. Accordingly, this writ petition is dismissed.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Mkr./-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	26.03.2026
Transmission Date	

