

PLEASE SUBSCRIBE TO THIS LINK AND LIKE THIS PAGE IN FACEBOOK, AND SHARE IT WITH YOUR FRIENDS AND RELATIVES: <https://www.facebook.com/BankBachaoDeshBachao/>

Editorial

NIGHTMARE!

On June 12, 2025, an Air India flight bound for London crashed into a densely populated area shortly after taking off from Ahmadabad Airport. Tragically, all 242 passengers including crew members except one were killed, and at least 38 others, mostly junior doctors in a hostel, also lost their lives during lunchtime that day. Common Bond expresses deep sympathy to the families of the victims.

For many years, the Boeing Company, the manufacturer of the Dreamliner aircraft, has faced a series of issues that led to the temporary grounding of its 787 planes worldwide, as well as quality concerns that halted deliveries. In April 2024, a Boeing engineer, Mr. Sam Salehpour, claimed that the model of the 787 Dreamliner was not properly assembled and could break apart mid-flight after several uses. He attributed this problem to changes in how the aircraft's massive sections were fitted together on assembly lines, with parts sourced from different manufacturers that did not align correctly.

Boeing has acknowledged these manufacturing

changes and has faced numerous issues at its South Carolina plant where the Dreamliner is produced. A prominent Boeing whistleblower, Mr. John Barnett, who raised concerns about the company's manufacturing practices, was found dead in March 2024. We trust that the various investigative agencies examining the accident will uncover the truth.

Unfortunately, following this devastating crash, significant issues have arisen regarding the safety of air travel in our country. Bankers rely on aircraft services for their professional activities, and we cannot simply remain passive bystanders to the critical question of passenger safety and related matters.

We have closely monitored discussions surrounding this accident across electronic, print, and social media. A common conclusion is that the aircraft is used for more than 17 hours in domestic circuits and may be operated for extended hours on international routes. Little attention is paid to maintenance and proper upkeep, which is directly linked to a shortage of skilled personnel and the recruitment of

A JUG FILLS DROP BY DROP

semi-skilled workers, likely driven by a focus on profit. Many airports have already been privatized. Undermining the dominance of public sector airlines like Indian Airlines the authorities have allowed a private carrier to gain virtual monopoly control over Indian airspace. Just a year ago, Air India was taken over by the Tata Group, despite their lack of experience in passenger air services for decades, even with their storied past in the 1940s and 1950s.

It is time to confront the uncomfortable question of whether airlines and other public utilities in our country operate solely for profit or aim to provide public services at reasonable prices to the millions of citizens who deserve a share of economic development and can contribute to nation-building. This issue extends to the banking sector, where there is a troubling trend toward class banking at the expense of social banking, moving away from the principles of mass banking.

Accidents will inevitably occur, but they should not arise from policy changes that prioritize profit and exploitation over the safety and needs of ordinary citizens. This reality is evident in Boeing's struggle to navigate a competitive landscape by implementing controversial cost-cutting measures and technological alternatives. It also mirrors our domestic economy, where the sale of public assets is viewed as a solution to the structural challenges hindering national growth and prosperity.

In conclusion, seemingly unrelated issues are intertwined with the fundamental concept of a social system that prioritizes the needs and welfare of its citizens.

- # **March on comrades,**
- # **NationAgainstPrivatisation**
- # **BankBachaoDeshBachao**

CIRCULAR

We are reproducing the full text of Circular No. 2025/28 dated 18th June, 2025 by AIBOC on the Conciliation Meeting held on 17.06.2025 by CLC.

Dear Comrades,

CONCILIATION MEETING HELD ON 17-6-2025 BY CLC

We reproduce the text of UFBU Circular no. 2025/11 dated 18.06.2025 for your information.

Dear Comrades,

Conciliation meeting held on 17-6-2025 by CLC

Our members are aware that consequent to our call for Strike, the Chief Labour Commissioner of the

IN THE SKY THERE IS NO DISTINCTION OF EAST AND WEST

Ministry of Labour, Government of India, held two rounds of conciliation meetings on 18-3-2025 and 21-3-2025 wherein it was decided, in view of the discussions with the IBA and the officials of the Dept. of Financial Services, Ministry of Finance and the assurances of the CLC, to postpone our two days' strike action.

Subsequently, IBA had called us for bipartite discussions on 23-4-2025, the outcome of which has been informed to members in our previous circular. This was followed by conciliation meeting on 29-4-2025 the details of which have also been communicated to all our unions.

As a follow up of this, one more round of conciliation proceedings were held yesterday i.e. 17-6-2025 by the Chief Labour Commissioner. Representatives from the Dept. of Financial Services, Ministry of Finance, IBA and Bank managements were present. From UFBU, representatives of our 9 unions were present.

Gist of the discussions held during the conciliation proceedings:

5 Days Banking:

We pointed out that the strike was postponed only on the assurance of the DFS that the issue is receiving serious attention of the Government and since there has been no development in the issue. We informed the Government that if there is

further delay in the matter, UFBU will be constrained to revive the strike call. The CLC informed that he has also taken up the issue with the DFS. DFS representatives explained that they are of the sensitivity of the issue and that the matter is under consideration of the Government though timeline can't be committed on the same. We informed the IBA and Government that UFBU cannot wait indefinitely and that the UFBU is considering reviving the strike call.

Increasing attacks on Bank staff in Branches :

We welcomed the communication sent by the Secretary, DFS to all the Chief Secretaries of the States and UTs to provide adequate safety measures with instructions to issue suitable advisories to sensitize and instruct District Magistrates and the State Police to (i) Take all preventive measures to avoid such incidents in bank branches including deployment of local police/ patrolling during peak banking hours at vulnerable locations, (ii) Ensure prompt and effective response to such complaints by the designated law enforcement agencies and (iii) Take strong and deterrent action against perpetrators under relevant provisions. But we pointed out that such attacks still continue and quoted the instance that occurred in SBI, Dhule a few days ago. The CLC advised the IBA to follow up the matter and advise the Banks to take immediate steps to avoid any such occurrences in future.

THERE HAS TO BE EVIL SO THAT GOOD CAN PROVE ITS PURITY ABOVE IT

Revised PLI Scheme of the DFS for Scale IV officers and above:

We pointed out that even though the issue is under conciliation and hence the managements are expected to await further outcome of the proceedings, Punjab National Bank has implemented the PLI for employees and officers upto Scale III. CLC expressed his view that PNB management should not have done this when the issue is before him.

Representative of DFS that it is proposed to give flexibility to the Banks' Board for identification of officers in different brackets in each scale, within the ambit of the PLI scheme. However, we did not agree to this since according to us, any Incentive should be for collective performance. After a lot of discussions, it was agreed that representatives of unions and the IBA would discuss the issue to come up with certain proposal within the ambit of the scheme.

Such proposal shall be submitted to the DFS for review of the present scheme in the light of the proposal so that a consensus may be arrived at in order to maintain smooth and cordial relation in the industry.

In the meantime, all the Banks are to await the outcome and not proceed with the implement of PLI for the year 2024-25.

Recruitments and Outsourcing:

Some of the Banks like Union Bank, Bank of Baroda, Indian Bank, SBI, Canara Bank and Punjab & Sind bank informed the details of the recruitments made for 2025-26 and the tentative intake for 2026-27. CLC opined that all the Banks should provide the details in order to understand the issue in totality in the light of the demands of the Unions. Hence it was decided that IBA would collect the necessary data before further discussions.

We pointed out that in respect of substaff, Banks are not resorting to recruitment in view of the minutes signed with DFS and this is resulting in huge unfilled vacancies and Banks employing casual and temporary employees for the same. Bank of Baroda management informed that they are going for recruitment of 500 substaff. We pointed out that managements are seeking to outsource these vacancies instead of recruiting regular employees. IBA informed that the issue of areas of outsourcing needs to be discussed and resolved bilaterally as already advised by the CLC. CLC advised that IBA and the Unions have to sit together and bilaterally resolve the issue of recruitments and outsourcing.

Enhancement in Gratuity limit:

We took up this issue and it was informed that the matter is under process at the Government level for increasing the limit to ₹ 25 lacs under the

Gratuity Act.

Appointment of Workman/Officer Directors:

We took up the issue and DFS representatives informed that the proposals sent by them to the Appointments Committee of the Cabinet – ACC are awaiting the approval.

The conciliation proceedings have been adjourned to 11th August, 2025 for further discussions.

With greetings,

Comradely Yours,

Sd/-

Rupam Roy

General Secretary

SHARED ARTICLE

We are sharing excerpts of an article published in The Kanal published on 17.06.2025 by Neha Bodke.

PUBLIC SECTOR BANKS OUTPERFORM PRIVATE BANKS IN PROFITS, STRUGGLE TO HOLD GROUND IN MARKET SHARE'

Public Sector Banks (PSBs) in India have posted historic financial results in FY 2025, achieving significant progress across profitability, asset quality, and operational efficiency. However, their market share in both deposits and credit continues to shrink, raising urgent concerns over their long-term positioning in the country's banking landscape.

The total net profit of all public sector banks in FY25 stood at ₹ 1.87 lakh crore, marking a 27.39% increase over the previous year. In contrast, private sector banks registered a total profit of ₹ 1.81 lakh crore, with a more modest growth rate of 7.01%.

The trend marks a significant shift in profitability dynamics. Public banks, which were previously seen as lagging in earnings, have now matched and even outpaced private peers in absolute profit numbers for the financial year ending March 2025.

PSBS ACHIEVE MAJOR GAINS IN ASSET QUALITY

PSBs also achieved substantial reductions in bad loans. The gross NPAs fell from ₹ 6.52 lakh crore in FY21 to ₹ 2.90 lakh crore in FY25, while net NPAs declined from ₹ 1.98 lakh crore to ₹ 55,971 crore over the same period. This indicates both an improvement in recovery mechanisms and better credit discipline.

On a percentage basis, gross NPAs of public sector banks fell from 9.42% in FY21 to 2.59% in FY25, and net NPAs from 3.07% to just 0.51%, a remarkable improvement in asset quality.

THREE THINGS CANNOT BE LONG HIDDEN: THE SUN, THE MOON AND THE TRUTH

Common Bond, July - 2025

Private banks also saw improvement, but not as sharply. Gross NPAs in private sector banks stood at ₹ 1.27 lakh crore in FY25 compared to ₹ 1.65 lakh crore in FY21. Their net NPAs were ₹ 34,732 crore, down from ₹ 53,725 crore in 2021.

The current profits are largely driven by reversal of earlier provisions, not by increased business volume or service-led income. Without volume-led growth, this profitability isn't sustainable.

OPERATING PROFIT AND TOTAL BUSINESS SURGE

Public banks' operating profit reached ₹ 3.13 lakh crore in FY25, up from ₹ 2.02 lakh crore in FY21 with a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of over 11%. Total business (deposits plus advances) also saw robust growth, increasing from ₹ 170.62 lakh crore in FY21 to ₹ 257.08 lakh crore in FY25, registering an 11.08% CAGR.

Despite these strong operational numbers, market share continues to decline. PSBs' share in total deposits fell from 68.96% in FY21 to 63.91% in FY25, while in total advances, their share decreased from 63.44% to 59.93% over the same five-year period.

Private sector banks, particularly large new-generation banks like HDFC Bank, ICICI Bank, Axis Bank, and Kotak Mahindra Bank have aggressively gained ground through branch expansion,

technology, and customer-centric models.

STAFFING AND RESOURCE STRAIN HIGHLIGHTED

This also includes concerns over staff shortages and workload pressures. Total staff strength in PSBs declined from 8.07 lakh in FY21 to 7.75 lakh in FY25, a net loss of over 32,000 employees in five years, even as business volume and customer load increased.

Additionally, PSBs added just 1,487 branches between FY21 and FY25, indicating limited physical expansion compared to private players. Many PSBs also reported increasing reliance on outsourcing and contractual staffing, which has implications for service quality and employee morale.

The government claims to grant autonomy to banks, but at the same time, bureaucratic instructions to halt clerical and sub-staff recruitment choke operational capacity. Without adequate manpower, public banks simply cannot deliver.

Excessive reliance on outsourcing and contractual employment invites serious operational risks. Many fraud cases today have roots in such unregulated staffing practices.

While staffing is a pressing concern, deeper systemic challenges related to governance and

BETTER THAN A HUNDRED YEARS OF IDLENESS IS ONE DAY SPENT IN DETERMINATION

digital infrastructure further hinder PSBs' efficiency.

The IT infrastructure in many PSBs lags behind — software bottlenecks, underpowered hardware, and capacity issues prevent banks from operating at full throttle. They're told to perform on par with private players but denied the tools to do so.

CORPORATE GOVERNANCE CONCERNS

Experts also point to weakening corporate governance as a major barrier to PSB growth. Many banks are operating with board positions vacant, undermining decision-making.

Nearly 50% of board positions are vacant. Legally, there should be representation from depositors, agriculture, legal fields, etc. But in some banks,

only five of the 14 board members are active, mostly government nominees or long-time directors. Audit committees, in some cases, aren't even operationalised.

The financial numbers demonstrate that PSBs remain crucial and high-performing pillars of India's banking sector. Their role in financial inclusion, credit access to rural and priority sectors, and crisis-time stability remains unmatched. However, their shrinking market share, reduced workforce, and limited capital support demand urgent policy focus.

As the government explores structural reforms, experts and stakeholders will be closely watching whether these banks are empowered to expand, or sidelined in favor of aggressive privatisation. ■

CIRCULARS

- 25 dated 05th June, 2025** : Increasing attacks and assaults in Bank Branches - DFS issued Advisories to all State Governments
- 26 dated 11th June, 2025** : Com P. V. Mohanan Beckons, Comrade PV Mohanan Beacons
- 27 dated 13th June, 2025** : Text of UFBU Circular No. 2025/10 on Bipartite Talks with IBA on Group Medical Insurance Policy for employees, officers and retirees
- 28 dated 18th June, 2025** : Conciliation Meeting held on 17.06.2025 by CLC

YOU WILL NOT BE PUNISHED FOR YOUR ANGER, YOU WILL BE PUNISHED BY YOUR ANGER

JUDICIAL

2025 LLR 493

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
CIVIL APPEAL NO.7039 OF 2025**

(arising out of Special Leave Petition (C) No.26933 of 2019)

A. M. Kulshreshta

.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

Union Bank of India & Ors.

.....RESPONDENT

JUDGMENT

ABHAY S. OKA, J.

1. XXXXX

FACTUAL ASPECTS

2. The appellant was an employee of the Union Bank of India (hereinafter referred to as “The Respondent Bank”), where he served for approximately 34 years from 1984 to 2018. He was promoted to the post of Deputy General Manager in 2016 and was due to retire on 30 th June, 2019.

3. The Respondent Bank vide order dated 21st August, 2018, suspended the appellant pending further disciplinary action, alleging that the appellant, in his prior role as the Regional Head, Meerut, had adopted a very casual approach while sanctioning credit proposals in 16 accounts submitted by Mid-corporate Ghaziabad Branch. It was alleged that he sanctioned huge limits to newly incorporated firms without ensuring proper due diligence by the branch or processing officers. On 18th January, 2019, after approximately 6 months of the suspension order, a show cause notice was issued to the appellant, asking him to show cause as to why disciplinary action should not be initiated against him. On 27th March, 2019, another show cause notice was issued to the appellant incorporating

the same omissions and commissions as alleged in the previous show cause notice, but in relation to other parties. The appellant made multiple representations to the Respondent Bank, requesting it to revoke his suspension. However, the same was of no avail.

4. The appellant preferred Civil Misc. Writ Petition No. 6976 of 2019 before the Hon’ble High Court of Allahabad against Order dated 21st August, 2018. The General Manager of the Respondent Bank (hereinafter referred to as, “General Manager”) submitted personal affidavit dated 23 rd May, 2019 before the Hon’ble High Court justifying the delay in issuing the charge sheet as attributable to the matter being referred to the Central Vigilance Commission (hereinafter referred to as, “the CVC”) in terms of Regulation 19 of the Union of India Officer Employees’ (Discipline & Appeal) Regulations, 1976 (hereinafter referred to as, “1976 Regulations”). The relevant extract of the General Manager’s affidavit is as follows:

“32. That, the IAC has viewed/regarded the case of 16 officials, including that of appellant, as a Vigilance case.

33. That since the appellant being an

Executive in TEGS-VI and as also the matter Involving other executive/officials, making it a composite case, in terms of Regulation 19 of Union Bank of India Officers Employee's (Discipline and Appeal) Regulations, 1976 and guidelines of the Central Vigilance Commission as circulated vide Circular NO. 07/04/15 dated 27.04.2015 (ANNEXURE CA - 4) the matter has been sent to the central Vigilance Commission for first stage advice.

34. That accordingly a request has been sent to Central Vigilance Officer (CVO) of the Bank to forward the matter on 23.04.2019 to Central Vigilance Commission (CVC) seeking their first stage. The advice of CVC is still awaited." The Disciplinary Authority/Executive Director of the Respondent Bank (hereinafter referred to as, "Executive Director") submitted personal affidavit dated 13th June, 2019 before the High Court, inter alia, stating that the matter was referred to the CVC, and the charge sheet would be issued to the appellant on receipt of the CVC's advice. The relevant extract of the Executive Director's affidavit is as follows:

XXXXX

5. Learned Single Judge of the High Court by Order dated 20th June, 2019 quashed Order dated 21st August, 2018 on the ground that continuing the suspension of the appellant since 21st August 2018 without even initiating or serving charge sheet for almost a year and that too at the fag end of the career of the appellant is wholly arbitrary and illegal. At the same time, the High Court granted liberty to the Respondent Bank to initiate any further proceedings that it may deem fit. Accordingly, the Executive Director issued a letter dated 28th June, 2019 to the appellant, stating that the disciplinary proceedings against him will continue and that he would not receive any pay, allowance or retiral benefits for the period till the completion of the disciplinary proceedings.

6. The appellant preferred Civil Misc. Writ Petition

No. 10800 of 2019 before the Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad seeking quashing of the charge sheet dated 10th June, 2019 on the ground that the charge sheet was served without seeking the advice of the CVC, which violated the mandatory requirement under Regulation 19 of the 1976 Regulations. The appellant also sought a direction to the Respondent Bank to consider his case for payment of pension under the Union Bank of India Employees' Pension Regulation, 1995 and to pay the pension to the Appellant along with consequential relief.

7. The learned Single Judge by his judgement and order dated 26th July, 2019 dismissed the Writ Petition holding that no ground was made out to quash the charge sheet and directed the appellant to cooperate in the enquiry. The appellant challenged the said Order by filing Special Appeal No. 963 of 2019. The Division Bench by impugned Judgement and Order dated 20th September, 2019 dismissed the appeal, holding that it was not necessary to seek the CVC's advice before issuing the charge sheet.

RELEVANT PROVISIONS

8. The issues involved in this appeal require consideration of Regulation 19 of the 1976 Regulations, which reads as follows:

"Regulation 19. Consultation with Central Vigilance Commission: The Bank shall consult the Central Vigilance Commission wherever necessary, in respect of all disciplinary cases having a vigilance angle" The regulation requires the Respondent Bank to consult the CVC in respect of all disciplinary cases with a vigilance angle, wherever deemed necessary. The language of the rule stipulates a mandatory consultation obligation by the usage of the word 'shall', and at the same time grants the Respondent Bank a degree of discretion by limiting the consultation to 'wherever necessary'. A question may arise whether the said provision is mandatory or directory.

SUBMISSIONS

XXXXX

9. XXXXX

10. XXXXX

11. XXXXX

Submissions on behalf of the Respondents

12. XXXXX

13. XXXXX

14. XXXXX

CONSIDERATION OF SUBMISSIONS

15. In the present case, factual aspects are very relevant. Material factual aspects set out in a chronology are as under:-

- a. The appellant was employed with the respondent Union Bank of India from the year 1984;
- b. In the year 2016, he was promoted to the post of Deputy General Manager;
- c. On 30th June 2019, the appellant was to be superannuated;
- d. The appellant had a blemishless record till 21 st August 2018, when the Bank suspended him. The allegation against the appellant was that, as the Regional Head at Meerut, he adopted a very casual approach while sanctioning credit proposals in 16 accounts sent by the Mid-corporate Ghaziabad branch. It is alleged that the appellant sanctioned huge limits to newly

incorporated firms without ensuring proper diligence by the branch/processing officers;

- e. On 18th January 2019 and 27th March 2019, two show cause notices were served upon the appellant, calling upon him to show cause why a disciplinary action should not be initiated against him;
- f. As the representations made by the appellant for revoking suspension were not considered, the appellant filed a writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court of Allahabad to challenge the order of suspension. In the said writ petition, the General Manager filed his affidavit justifying the delay in issuing the charge sheet, stating that the matter was referred to the CVC for first-stage advice, but the advice was not received. He relied upon Regulation 19 of the 1976 Regulations. In the same writ petition, another affidavit dated 13th June 2019 was filed by the Executive Director stating that on receipt of advice from the CVC, Articles of charge/charge sheet will be issued to the appellant;
- g. By the order dated 20th June 2019, the High Court quashed the order of suspension dated 21 st August 2018 on the ground that continuing the suspension of the appellant from 21st August 2018 without even initiating or serving a charge sheet for almost a year was arbitrary and illegal. However, liberty was reserved to the Bank to initiate further proceedings; and h. On 18th June 2016, without waiting for the CVC advice, a charge sheet dated 10th June 2019 was served upon the appellant. Thereafter, by a letter dated 28th June 2019, the Executive Director informed the appellant that the disciplinary proceedings against him would continue, and he would not receive any pay, allowances, or retiral benefits until the completion of the proceedings.

HE WHO SEEKS HAPPINESS BY HURTING WILL NEVER FIND IT

16. Regulation 19 of the 1976 Regulations stipulates that the Bank shall consult the CVC, wherever necessary, in respect of disciplinary cases having a vigilance angle. A reading of the regulation makes it clear that in cases where the Respondent Bank deems that the consultation is necessary due to the case having a vigilance angle, the Respondent Bank is required to seek the advice of the CVC. Therefore, while the learned counsel has argued the question of whether consultation with the CVC is mandatory or discretionary, in the facts of this case, it is not necessary for us to delve into the said question. The reason is that the Respondent Bank has itself acknowledged that the case had a vigilance angle and consultation with the CVC is necessary, and therefore, the Respondent Bank had sought the opinion of the CVC.

17. We have already quoted the relevant parts of the Circulars dated 28th September 2000, 15th April 2004 and 27th April 2015 issued by the CVC. As can be seen from the Circulars, the CVC is being consulted at two stages for its advice. The first stage advice is sought before the issuance of the charge sheet, and the second stage advice is either on receipt of the reply to the charge sheet or on receipt of the enquiry report. As can be seen from the affidavit dated 23rd May 2019, filed by the General Manager of the Bank, the first stage advice of the CVC has been sought. The affidavit dated 13th June 2019 filed by the Executive Director also clearly states that on the receipt of the advice of the CVC, the Bank shall issue a charge sheet to the appellant. As stated earlier, within five days of filing the said affidavit, the charge sheet dated 10th June 2019 was served upon the appellant. This was done without receiving the first stage advice from the CVC.

18. In its counter-affidavit, the Respondent Bank has admitted that the CVC's first-stage advice was sought on 17 th May 2019. Notably, the advice was sought

from the CVC nine months after the suspension order. In fact, on 18 th January 2019 and 27th March 2019, show-cause notices were issued to the appellant, calling upon him to show cause why disciplinary action should not be initiated against him.

19. Thus, the respondent-Bank accepted that Regulation 19 of the 1976 Regulations was applicable and therefore, first- stage advice of the CVC was sought. Even before getting the first stage advice, on 10th June 2019, the charge sheet was kept ready which was served upon the appellant on 18 th June 2019. In this case, the Respondent Bank itself accepted the necessity of seeking first-stage advice from the CVC. Therefore, it was not open for the Bank to serve the charge sheet without receiving and considering the first stage advice by the CVC.

20. As stated earlier, only ten months before the date of superannuation, an order of suspension was served upon the appellant. This was done after 34 years of unblemished service. Although it was necessary to take the first stage advice of the CVC, the advice was sought only as late as on 17th May 2019. Twelve days before reaching the age of superannuation, a charge sheet was served upon the appellant, without receiving and considering the CVC's advice. This was despite the specific statement made by the Executive Director in the earlier petition on oath, which stated that the charge sheet would only be served upon receipt of advice from the CVC.

21. Once, the first stage advice of the CVC was called, it was the duty of the respondent-Bank to consider the advice and then take a decision to serve the chargesheet. Thus, the actions of the respondent-Bank are mala fide and arbitrary. The appellant was sought to be victimised at the fag end

COMMON BOND ENGLISH MONTHLY-R.N.I.NO :36648/82 - TOTAL NO. OF PAGES 12 JULY -2025

REGN. NO. KRNA/BGE - 1122/2023-2025 PUBLISHED ON 25-06-2025

POSTED AT BANGALURU PSO, MYSORE ROAD, BANGALURU - 560 026 / ON 2ND OF EVERY MONTH

LICENCED TO POST WITHOUT PRE-PAYMENT-LICENCE NO. PMG BG/WPP 330/2023-2025

of his unblemished career of 34 years.

22. The High Court committed a gross error by holding that Regulation 19 of the 1976 Regulations was not mandatory. This issue was irrelevant, as the Bank had itself acknowledged that in the facts of the case, it was necessary to seek first-stage advice from the CVC. It is also pertinent to note that no record was placed in the High Court to indicate that the CVC report had been received.

23. Now, at this stage, it will be unjust to allow the respondent-Bank to resume disciplinary proceedings. Almost six years have passed since the superannuation of the Appellant.

24. Though the appellant will be entitled to all retirement benefits, he shall not be entitled to any back wages.

CONCLUSION

25. Accordingly, the disciplinary proceedings, including the charge sheet dated 10th June 2019, are hereby quashed and set aside. Although the appellant shall not be entitled to back wages and allowances, the Respondent Bank shall release all retirement benefits admissible on the basis that the appellant has superannuated as of 30 th June 2019. The amount of retirement benefits due to the appellant in accordance with the law, shall be paid to the appellant within three months from today. The appeal is allowed on the above terms.■

.....J. (Abhay S. Oka)

.....J. (Augustine George Masih)

New Delhi;
May 20, 2025.

..Subscribe.....Establish....."Common Bond"

An Official Publication Of AIBOC

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor: COMRADE Rupam Roy

Member: Comrade Sekaran R

RATES OF SUBSCRIPTION: ANNUAL: ₹ 30/-

Drafts Should be Drawn

IN FAVOUR OF AIBOC AND MAILED TO

ALL INDIA BANK OFFICERS' CONFEDERATION

C/O STATE BANK OF INDIA OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION

(North Eastern Circle)

C/o State Bank of India, Local Head Office,
Dispur, Guwahati, Assam – 781006 ☎ : 9957563825

E-mail: aiboc.sectt@gmail.com

Web site: <http://www.aiboc.org>

REGISTERED NEWS PAPER

LICENSED TO POST
WITHOUT
PREPAYMENT

TO

If Undelivered Please Return To

The All India Bank Officers' Confederation

SBI Buildings, St.Mark's Road, Bangaluru - 560 001.

Printed & Published/Edited by Shri Rupam Roy on behalf of AIBOC, at State Bank Building, St.Mark's Road Bangaluru-560 001.
Printed by Smt. Nithya Lakshmi, at L. V. Press 3916, 7th Cross, 4th Main, Gayathri Nagar, Bangaluru - 560 021