
(2003) 12 AHC CK 0145
In the Allahabad High Court
Case No : C.M.W.P. No. 36653 of 1997

D.S. Bishnoi

APPELLANT

Vs

State Bank of India and Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 05-12-2003

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2004) 1 AWC 640 : (2004) 2 LLJ 543

Hon'ble Judges : Umeshwar Pandey, J; M. Katju, J

Bench : Division Bench

Advocate : Anu Jaiswal, R.K. Singh, R.K. Pathak, A.K. Singh, Aradhana Chauhan and S.K. Saxena, for the Appellant; Navin Sinha, for the Respondent

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

M. Katju and Umeshwar Pandey, JJ.—This writ petition has been filed against the impugned order dated 19.7.1996 (Annexure-12 to the writ petition) and the order dated 14.7.1997 (Annexure-13 to the writ petition).

2. Heard learned counsel for the parties.

3. The petitioner was a Branch Manager of the State Bank of India. He was given a charge-sheet dated 14.9.1993, vide Annexure-6 to the petition. He submitted his reply on 19.8.1995. vide Annexure-8 to the petition. Thereafter an inquiry was held in which he was given an opportunity of hearing. True copy of the inquiry report is Annexure-9 to the petition. A perusal of the same shows that charge Nos. I, II and IV have been proved by the Inquiry Officer but charge Nos. III and V have not been found proved. A perusal of charge Nos. I, II and IV which have been proved show that they are serious in nature. They indicate blatant irregularities committed by the petitioner. By letter dated 10.11.1995 vide Annexure-9 to the petition, the petitioner was forwarded a copy of the inquiry report and he was asked to show cause. The petitioner sent his reply to the show cause notice vide Annexure-10.

4. Subsequently by the impugned order dated 19.7.1996 (Annexure-12 to the

writ petition) the General Manager recommended his dismissal and he was dismissed from service. He filed an appeal which was considered in detail by the order dated 14.7.1997 (Annexure-13 to the petition), and his appeal was rejected.

5. The findings of the Inquiry Officer are findings of fact and we cannot interfere with the same in writ jurisdiction.

6. It has been held by a series of decisions that in a bank the highest degree of standards of devotion to duty and integrity are required to be maintained in order to maintain public confidence in the Bank vide Smt. Gangotri Devi Vs. State Election Commission, Panchayat and Local Self and Others, ; Ram Pratap Sonkar Vs. Chairman and Managing Director, Allahabad and others, ; K. K. Singh v. Gomti Gramin Bank 2002 ALJ 480 ; Union Bank of India Vs. Vishwa Mohan, , etc. Even if no loss has been caused to the Bank, the employee can be punished vide T. Venkata Narayana and Others Vs. Smt. Venkata Subbamma (dead) and Others, ; State Bank of India and others Vs. T.J. Paul, etc. The Inquiry Officer in his report has gone into great detail and we cannot sit as a Court of appeal against his findings. Petition is dismissed.