

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION**

INTERIM APPLICATION NO.7991 OF 2025

IN

WRIT PETITION NO.3847 OF 2025

Sneh GaglaniApplicant/Petitioner

Versus

Bank of MaharashtraRespondent

Ms. Sneh Gaglani, Petitioner present in person.
None for the Respondent.

CORAM : RAVINDRA V. GHUGE

&

ASHWIN D. BHOBE, JJ.

DATE : 30th MARCH, 2026

P.C. :-

1. The Petitioner, appearing in person, seeks recall of the order dated 25th November, 2025.

2. When we had heard the Petitioner in person in Writ Petition No.3847 of 2025, we noted that the Committee of Registrars of this Court had, by its opinion dated 26th September, 2025, expressed that the Petitioner would not be able to assist the Court. Yet, we permitted the Petitioner to address the Court. We observed that, being in person, she became emotional and

sentimental and, within a minute or two of advancing her submissions, started weeping in Court. We, therefore, counseled her and rendered assistance to her by engaging Mrs. Preeti Bhushan Walimbe, the learned Advocate practicing in the field of service law, who has conducted the case ‘*Pro-bono*’.

3. After hearing the learned Advocate, the Petition was disposed off with the following directions below paragraph no.6 of the order dated 25th November, 2025 :

6. In view of the above, this Petition is disposed off with the following directions :

(a) The Respondent shall decide the Departmental Appeal dated 1st March 2025, filed by the Petitioner challenging the final punishment awarded to her pursuant to the departmental inquiry. If the Rules permit, the Bank shall issue notice to the Petitioner, calling upon her to remain present before the Appellate Authority at Pune and to participate in the hearing on such dates as the appeal may be posted. Since the head office of the Bank is in Pune, the Petitioner would be at liberty to either travel for the hearing or address the Appellate Authority through video conferencing;

(b) After completion of the above exercise strictly in accordance with the Rules, we expect the Bank to deliver a reasoned order within 30 days from the date of completion of the hearing in the appeal. For the above exercise, we grant 45 days'

time for completing the hearing and 30 days' time thereafter for delivery of the reasoned order;

(c) The reasoned order would be communicated to the Petitioner within 24 hours of its passing, on the following email address :

Email address : bankinggrowth@gmail.com

(d) Insofar as the representation dated 1st February, 2021 and connected representations are concerned, if they are yet to be decided, the Respondent-Bank shall consider and decide them by following the due procedure laid down in law, within 60 days from the date of service of this order on the Respondent - Bank, by Speed Post AD or on the email address of the Bank;

(e) A printout of this order obtained from the official website of the Bombay High Court would be served upon the Respondent - Bank by the Petitioner, by email or by Speed Post A.D;

(f) The above-mentioned timelines of 45 days, 30 days and 60 days, respectively would be reckoned from the date of service of this order on the Respondent-Bank.

(g) All grounds raised in the report as well as in the representations dated 1st February, 2021 and the connected representations, would be dealt with by the Respondent - Bank.

4. In view of the above directions, the Petitioner's grievance regarding her pending Departmental Appeal was actually considered, and we had given a timeline to the Bank to follow the

steps set out in the directions below paragraph no.6 reproduced above.

5. Today, the Petitioner again appears in person and has tendered an Interim Application seeking recall of the said order. It is contended that the disciplinary proceedings initiated against her have caused prejudice to her. All the grounds set out below the heading “REASONS WHY ORDERS CAUSE SEVERE PREJUDICE TO THE PETITIONER” pertain to the disciplinary action that had already been initiated against her and she has been inflicted with punishment. Since her Departmental Appeal against the punishment was pending, we had directed that the same be decided expeditiously.

6. In view of the above, we do not find any reason to recall our order.

7. **The Interim Application is rejected.**

(ASHWIN D. BHOBE, J.)

(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE, J.)