

2025:PHHC:062690



**IN THE PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT AT  
CHANDIGARH**

224

**CWP-34492-2019**  
**Date of Decision: 12.05.2025**

**RANVIR SINGH BEHL THROUGH HIS LRs.**

... Petitioner

VERSUS

**PUNJAB AND SIND BANK AND ANOTHER**

... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ.**

Present: Mr. Amarpreet Singh and Mr. Arav Gupta,  
Advocates for the petitioner.

Mr. R. Kartikeya and Ms. R. Akanksha,  
Advocates for the respondents.

\*\*\*\*

**VINOD S. BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)**

Prayer in the present petition is for setting aside the communication dated 26.05.2016 (Annexure P-6) whereby the respondents declined to grant the benefit of leave encashment on the ground that the petitioner had been compulsorily retired.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the petitioner joined the respondent-Bank on 18.02.1976 and was posted as Senior Manager when he was served with a charge sheet dated 06.07.2012 in relation to certain acts of omission and commission followed by departmental inquiry. The petitioner was eventual ordered to compulsorily retired in terms of Regulation 4(h) of Punjab and Sind Bank Officer Employees (Discipline & Appeal) Regulations, 1981. The appeal filed against the same was also rejected by the Appellate Authority vide order dated 24.10.2013. Counsel contends that the

petitioner had served with the respondent-Bank for a period of nearly 37 years before the order of his compulsory retirement was passed and even though the Pension Payment Order w.r.t. other retiral dues was issued, however, the respondent-Bank did not grant the benefit of leave encashment in lieu of the accumulated leave for a period of 240 days. The petitioner thus approached the respondents for release thereof. A reference was also made to the circular issued by the Indian Bank Association dated 11.12.2015, whereby benefit of leave encashment to the compulsorily retired employees had been extended, for claiming the said benefit, however, the respondents declined the extension of such benefit to the petitioner. Counsel contends that the respondent-Bank has placed much reliance on the circular dated 11.05.2015 that had been issued by the Indian Bank Association, as per which the benefit of leave encashment had been extended to the compulsorily retired officials, however, the same had been restricted and made effective only w.e.f. 30.04.2015. The officials who had been compulsorily retired prior thereto were held to be not entitled to the benefit of leave encashment.

He contends that the applicability of the said circular was examined by a Full Bench of this Court in the matter of ***UCO Bank & Others Versus Anju Mathur*** reported as ***(2013) 3 SCT 272*** and it was held that no distinction could be carved out between Regulation 38 of UCO Bank Regulations as well as Punjab and Sind Bank Regulations respectively. It is submitted that relying upon the same, a similarly placed employee was held entitled to the benefit of leave encashment vide ***judgment dated 22.10.2019*** passed in ***CWP No.2314 of 2017*** titled as ***Surinder Singh Vs. Punjab and Sind Bank and Another.***

Learned arguing counsel for the respondents is not in a position to controvert the applicability of the aforesaid judgment and the case of the petitioner being at par with the case of ***Surinder Singh (supra)***.

In view of the above undisputed position in law, the present petition is allowed in terms of judgment dated **22.10.2019** passed in the case of ***Surinder Singh (supra)***.

**MAY 12, 2025.**

*Rajender*

**(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)  
JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned* : Yes/No

*Whether reportable* : Yes/No