



\$~112

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ W.P.(C) 1052/2026, CM APPL. 5098/2026, CM APPL. 5534/2026
ALL INDIA BANK OFFICERS CONFEDERATIONPetitioner

Through: Mr. P.C. Sen, Sr. Adv. Mr.
Prasanna S., AOR, Adv. Ms. Injila
Muslim Zaidi, Adv., Ms. Vanisha
Mehta Mr. Ashish Reddy, Adv. Ms.
Apoorva Singh, Adv. Mr. Prasanna
B, Adv.

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORSRespondents
Through: Mr Tushar Mehta, Solicitor General
of India with Mr Sanjay Kapur,
Advocate, Mr. Surya Prakash,
Advocate; Ms Smurthi, Advs.
Mr. Siddhartha Sinha, Senior Panel
Counsel
Mr. Rajesh Kumar Gautam, Miss
Likivi K Jakhalu Mr Deepanjal
Choudhary, Miss Azal Aekram, Advs.
Ms. Praveena Gautam, Adv., Mr.
Pawan Shukla, Adv., Ms. Tissy Annie
Thomas, Adv., Mr. Rohan Bansla,
Adv

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

% **ORDER**
27.01.2026

1. This is a writ petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking the following prayers:



“a) Issue a Writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction restraining the Respondent Nationalised Public Sector Banks (R-3 through R-14) from issuing any communications, letters or communiques generally or to any specific officer(s) threatening any adverse consequences for having participated in lawful strikes called by the Petitioner or any officer association that is a member of the Petitioner organisation or any other umbrella organisation that a Petitioner is a member of including the United Forum of Bank Unions.

b) Issue a writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction declaring that letters/communications/communiques issued by the Respondent Nationalised Public Sector Banks (R-3 through R-14) threatening officers with adverse consequences for the strike called on 27.01.2026 to be void and unenforceable...”

2. The petitioner after filing of the present petition has already proceeded for a strike from midnight of 26.01.2026 to 27.01.2026, which is considered as unlawful by the respondent banks. In pursuance thereof, the respondent banks have already cautioned the petitioner from going on strike through several communications.

3. Hence, the prayers as sought by the petitioner have already become infructuous as the respondent had already warned the petitioner and the petitioner had already continued with their strike.

4. As and when any consequences follow, the petitioner will be at liberty to initiate appropriate legal proceedings to challenge the same.



5. With these directions and liberty, the petition is disposed of, without expressing any opinion on the merits.

JASMEET SINGH, J

JANUARY 27, 2026/DM