



208 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

LPA-2274-2017 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 24.09.2025

State Bank of India and others ...Appellants

Vs.

Vinod Jetley ...Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ROHIT KAPOOR**

Present: Ms. Madhu Dayal, Advocate for the appellants.
Mr. Samarth Sagar, Adocate for the respondent.

ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA, J. (Oral)

1. Appellant – State Bank of India is the employer in the present appeal and is aggrieved by an order passed by the learned Single Judge dated 09.10.2017, whereby the punishments imposed upon the writ petitioner vide order dated 09.01.1997, 17.02.1997, 06.05.1997 as well as memos issued on 24.10.1997 and 16.12.1997, have been quashed. A direction has also been issued to the employer – appellant herein to re-consider the claim of the writ petitioner for promotion to the post of Senior Management Grade-IV w.e.f. 01.11.1995.

2. The short ground on which the judgment of the learned Single Judge is assailed is that the merits of none of the orders quashed by the learned Single Judge, has been evaluated and, therefore, the learned Single Judge has erred in interfering with the punishment imposed upon the writ petitioner.

3. Learned counsel for the respondent – writ petitioner contends that the relevant date for promotion to the post was 19.10.1996, by when disciplinary proceedings were not initiated against the writ petitioner. It is,

however, not disputed that the merits of the decision taken by the employer, have not been tested by the learned Single in the impugned judgment.

4. Learned counsel for the appellant, however, contends that the DPC was convened on 21.11.1996 by when a charge sheet has already been issued to the writ petitioner.

5. Be that as it may, in the facts of the case, we find that the orders assailed in the writ petition have neither been examined by the learned Single Judge nor any finding with regard to any illegality or otherwise, has been returned. Once that be so, the orders of the employer could not have been quashed by the learned Single in the manner as has been done.

6. Consequently, we have no option but to interfere in the present appeal and accordingly the judgment of the learned Single Judge dated 09.10.2017, is set aside. The appeal is accordingly allowed and writ petition is remitted to the learned Single Judge for afresh consideration of the cause. All questions including the pendency of disciplinary proceedings on the relevant date are left open for consideration before the learned Single Judge.

7. All pending misc. application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(ASHWANI KUMAR MISHRA)
JUDGE

(ROHIT KAPOOR)
JUDGE

24.09.2025

rajesh

1. Whether speaking/reasoned? : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable? : Yes/No