

10-04-2026
ct no. 13
Sl. 3+4
sp

CPAN 1966 of 2025
Sanjay Sutradhar
-Versus-

Lokesh Kumar Bhagat, Assistant General
Manager, Central Bank of India.

In
MAT 197 of 2024
With
CAN 1 of 2024
With
CAN 2 of 2024
Central Bank of India
-Versus-

Sanjay Sutradhar

With
RVW 29 of 2026
With
CAN 1 of 2026
With
CAN 2 of 2026
Central Bank of India
-Versus-

Sanjay Sutradhar

Mr. Ranjay Dey, ld. Sr. Adv.
Mr. Biswambhar Jha,
Mr. H.K. Jha.

...for the appellant/Bank.

Mr. Pratik Majumder,
Mr. Snehasish Dey.

..for the applicant in CPAN 1966 of 2025.
...for the respondent no. 1 in RVW 29 of 2026.

Re: CAN 1 of 2026 in RVW 29 of 2026

1. CAN 1 of 2026 has been filed seeking
condonation of delay of 70 days in preferring the review
application.

2. Sufficient grounds are available to indicate the delay in filing the review application.
3. Hence, the delay is condoned.
4. Accordingly, CAN 1 of 2026 is allowed and disposed of.

Re: RVW 29 of 2026

5. RVW 29 of 2026 is pressed on the ground that there is error apparent on the face of record in the decision of a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court dated 27th October, 2025 of which one of us (Rai Chattopadhyay, J.) is present.
6. The crux of the review applicant is directed against the decision of the Co-ordinate Bench in paragraphs 33 and 34 of the said judgment.
7. It is submitted by Mr. Dey, learned Senior Advocate appearing for the bank by reference to paragraph nos. 29, 30, 31 and 32 of the said judgment that the Co-ordinate Bench while setting out the applicable law with regard to the power of the Writ Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India has failed to ignore the perversity in the finding of the CGIT. The perversity, according to Mr. Dey, is that the first part of the reference to the CGIT by the Central Bank mandated

examination whether there was master-servant relationship between the appellant and the respondent employee.

8. Admittedly there was no appointment letter issued by the Central Bank of India to the employee concerned. The Tribunal as well as the Single Bench of this Court had given sufficient finding of fact to establish such master-servant relationship based on the continuous payment of salary and allowances to the employee. There is sufficient discussion by Co-ordinate Bench as well as Single Bench and the Tribunal that while an appointment letter is the first and most important evidence of establishing such relationship, the absence of such appointment letter would not be fatal in determining master-servant relationship if there is other surrounding evidence like continuous payment of salary and allowances.
9. Having regard to the above, this Court is of the view that the impugned judgment and order dated 27th October, 2025, calls for no review whatsoever.
10. Hence, RVW 29 of 2026 is, thus, dismissed with costs assessed at Rs. 25,000/- payable

by the Central Bank of India to the respondent employee Sanjay Sutradhar.

11. Consequently, CAN 2 of 2026 shall stand dismissed.

Re: CPAN 1966 of 2025

12. Reference in this regard is made to a recent decision of the Supreme Court dated 24.02.2026 in ***Contempt Petition (Civil) No. 5/2026 in C.A. No. 7023/2025 (Israr Prasad & Ors. Vs. Amarnath Prasad & Ors.)***, particularly, paragraphs 27 to 30 thereof.
13. Since there is no affidavit in response to the contempt application till date, this Court takes a grim view of the conduct of the alleged contemnors.
14. Let a rule be issued as prayed for against the alleged contemnors. The alleged contemnors shall be present virtually on the adjourned date.
15. Rule is made returnable on **8th May, 2026**.
16. The applicant shall provide the name of the current incumbent in the post of contemnors enlisted in the application and carry out the necessary amendments in the contempt application in course of the day.

17. The applicant shall put in the requisites for the aforesaid purpose in course of the day.

(Rajasekhar Mantha, J.)

(Rai Chattopadhyay, J.)

Rule is drawn in a
separate sheet.