



\$~9

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

+ W.P.(C) 140/2026, CM APPL. 721/2026

PAWAN KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sanjay Beniwal, Ms. Maisha and
Mr. R.K. Seewal, Advocates.

versus

INDIAN BANK

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar Gautam,
Mr. Deepanjal Choudhary, Ms. Likivi
K. Jakhalu and Mr. Azal Aekram,
Advocates.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

%

10.02.2026

1. The Petitioner joined the erstwhile Allahabad Bank as a Scale-I Probationary Officer on 16th August, 2010 and was promoted to Scale-II in the year 2013. He thereafter earned further promotions and is presently working as a Scale-IV Officer. The Petitioner received an explanation memo dated 1st October, 2024 alleging certain acts of omission and commission while functioning as Manager at Mangolpuri Kalan Branch during the period 15th June, 2015 to 2nd July, 2016 under the Delhi Central Zone. He submitted his explanation thereto; however, the Bank did not accept the same and instead issued a chargesheet dated 17th December, 2025.
2. The Petitioner has requested the Respondent to withdraw the chargesheet contending that it is wholly unjustified. In support of this



contention, reliance is placed upon the Staff Accountability Policy of the Respondent Bank, which reads as under:

“TIME LIMIT FOR INITIATION OF DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS AND ROLE OF INSPECTING OFFICIALS:

xx.....xx.....xx.....

No disciplinary proceeding will lie against any official for any lapse not detected within two successive internal regular inspection of the same account or 4 (Four) years from the date of event or occurrence of the lapse, whichever, is earlier. Serious irregularities detected during this period must be brought to the notice of the erring official / higher authority. If the irregularities could be rectified immediately, no accountability should be considered.”

3. The Petitioner submits that the chargesheet is time-barred, having been issued after nearly nine and a half years of his tenure at the Mangolpuri Kalan Branch. He further submits that during this period he has received promotions. Reliance is also placed on the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***UCO Bank & Ors. v. Rajendra Shankar Shukla***¹, wherein the Court held that unexplained and inordinate delay in issuance of a chargesheet renders the disciplinary proceedings vulnerable and liable to be set aside.

4. Mr. Rajesh Kumar Gautam, counsel for the Respondent, submits that the present petition is premature, as the matter is presently only at the stage of issuance of the chargesheet.

5. The Court has considered the aforesaid contentions. Since at present only a chargesheet has been issued and the Petitioner has been afforded an opportunity to put forth his defence, he must first submit his response so that the Bank can examine the same and form an opinion, taking into consideration, the precedents cited by the Petitioner regarding delay in

¹ (2018) 14 SCC 92.



issuance of the chargesheet.

6. In the event the Petitioner's reply does not find favour, the Respondent shall pass an appropriate reasoned order considering the Petitioner's defence. If the Petitioner remains aggrieved, he shall be at liberty to avail appropriate remedies in accordance with law.

7. Since the time period to file a reply to the chargesheet has already lapsed, the Petitioner is granted a further period of fifteen (15) days to submit his response.

8. With the above directions, the petition is disposed of, along with any pending application(s).

SANJEEV NARULA, J

FEBRUARY 10, 2026

nk