

14.05.2026
SL No.4
Court No.12
(gc)

**MAT 685 of 2026
CAN 1 of 2026**

**Debasis Mukherjee
Vs.
The Central Public Information Officer &
General Manager-Human Resources, IDBI Bank & Ors.**

Mr. Narattam Acharyya,
Mr. Shamit Dutta,
Mr. Prasenjit Jana

...for the Appellant.

Re: CAN 1 of 2026

1. This is an application for condonation of delay. There is a delay of 588 days in preferring the appeal.
2. Considering the averments made in paragraphs 7 and 8 of the said application and the medical reports annexed to the application, we are satisfied that the appellant was prevented by sufficient cause from filing the appeal within the stipulated period of limitation on the ground of ill-health.
3. The delay of 588 days is condoned.
4. Accordingly, CAN 1 of 2026 is allowed and disposed of.
5. The appeal is regularized.

Re: MAT 685 of 2026

6. The appeal arises out of an order dated July 31, 2024 passed in WPA 19119 of 2021. By the order impugned, the learned Judge

dismissed the writ petition, *inter alia*, granting liberty to the appellant/petitioner to find out from the scheme of amalgamation, the provision for promotion and take appropriate steps in accordance with law.

7. The appellant is aggrieved by a decision of the employer, IDBI Bank Ltd. to promote him to Grade 8 from Grade 7. According to the appellant, he had suffered financial loss on account of such promotion.
8. Accordingly, the appellant made certain queries before the CPIO of the concerned employer.
9. We find that the queries made were with regard to the validity of the promotion.
10. However, the CPIO asked the appellant to obtain the scheme of amalgamation upon payment of cost and also informed him that, the second information sought for with regard to the validity of the promotion was a hypothetical question, asking for an opinion of the CPIO on the issue of promotion, which could not be answered by the CPIO. The appellant was also informed that, an appeal would lie before the bank's appellate authority, if the appellant was aggrieved by the information supplied. It appears that the scheme was obtained by the appellant and

the appellant also preferred an appeal. The said appeal was not disposed of. A review application was also preferred, which was disposed of with reasoned order. Being aggrieved, the writ petition was filed on the ground that the scheme of amalgamation did not provide for promotion, and promotion of the appellant was not valid in law.

11. In our considered opinion, the appellant was rightly directed to approach the appropriate forum to take steps with regard to his grievance. Service conditions of an employee of the IDBI Bank Ltd. cannot be adjudicated upon by the writ court.
12. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.
13. There shall be no order as to costs.
14. Parties are to act on the server copy of this order.

(Shampa Sarkar, J.)

(Ajay Kumar Gupta, J.)