



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6054 of 2026

Hemant Son of Shambhu Prasad Roy, resident of House No. F-98, Near Patel Chowk, S.G.M. Nagar, NIT, Faridabad, Haryana-121001. At present resident of House of Ashok Kumar Singh, Near Ram Rekha Mission School, Aurangabad, Bihar-824101.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. Punjab National Bank through the Managing Director- cum-CEO, Head Office (Corporate Office), Plot No. 4, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075.
2. The Executive Director- HR, Head Office (Corporate Office)- Plot No. 4, Sector- 10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075.
3. Chief General Manager-Cum- Appellate Authority, Punjab National Bank, Human Resources Division, Head Office (Corporate Office)- Plot No.- 4, Sector- 10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075.
4. General Manager, Disciplinary Authority, Punjab National Bank, Zonal Office Delhi, Disciplinary Action Cell, 2nd Floor, 7, Bhikaiji Cama Place, New Delhi- 110066.
5. Zonal Manager, Punjab National Bank, Human Resource Department, Zonal Office, 2nd Floor, Chanakya Tower, R-Block, Patna-800001, Bihar.
6. Circle Head, Punjab National Bank, Circle Office-Aurangabad.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Ram Ganesh, Advocate
For the Bank	:	Mr. Prashant Kumar, Advocate
		Mr. Nishant Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 24-04-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Bank.

2. The petitioner has filed the present writ petition for the following relief:

“I. For issuance of a writ in the nature of writ of certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction to quash the order ZO: DAC: 4103 dated 10.09.2025 (Annexure- P/13) passed by the





disciplinary authority whereby major penalty of “Reduction to one lower stage in the time scale of pay for the period of three months with further directions that he will not earn increments of pay during the period of such reduction and on expiry of such period, the reduction will have the effect of postponing the future increments of his pay” has been imposed to the petitioner in the matter of charge sheet dated 09.01.2025.

II. For issuance of a writ in the nature of writ of certiorari or any other appropriate writ, order or direction to quash the order HRMD/HO/DAD/SA/38444 dated 28.01.2026 (Annexure- P/15) passed by the Chief General Manager-cum-Appellate Authority, Human Resources Division, HO, New Delhi whereby and whereunder he has rejected the appeal preferred by the petitioner being no merit and confirmed penalty imposed by the disciplinary authority vides order dated 10.09.2025.

III. For issuance of a writ in the nature of writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction commanding the respondents to reduce quantum of punishment as the same is shocking conscience of the court as the same is not proportionate to the charge.”

3. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Bank, at the outset, raised the issue of maintainability of the present writ petition within the territorial jurisdiction of this Court and submits that the departmental proceeding was conducted and concluded in Delhi and the appeal filed before the appellate authority has also been rejected at Delhi, therefore,





this Court does not have jurisdiction to entertain the prayers made in the present writ petition.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although the entire departmental proceeding has been conducted at Delhi, however the charge memo was served to the petitioner at his official address in the State of Bihar, therefore, the writ petition is very much maintainable before the territorial jurisdiction of this Court. He refers to and relies on a judgment of the Rajasthan High Court in the case of **State of Rajasthan & Ors. vs Swaika Properties & Anr.**, reported in (1985) 3 SCC 217, wherein it has been held in paragraph nos. 2.1 and 3 as follows:

“2.1. The question whether service of notice is or is not an integral part of the cause of action within Art 226(2) of the Constitution must depend upon the nature of the impugned order giving rise to a ‘cause of action’. ‘Cause of action’ is a bundle of facts which taken with the law applicable to them gives the petitioner a right to relief against the respondent. 2.2 There was complete lack of jurisdiction on the part of the Calcutta High Court to have entertained the writ petition. The service of notice under s. 52 (2) of the Act was not an integral part of the cause of action within the meaning of Art. 226 (2) of the Constitution and therefore the High Court had no jurisdiction to entertain the writ petition or issue an ad-interim prohibitory order.





3. In the instant case, the notification dated February 8, 1984 issued by the State Government under s. 52 (1) of the Act became effective the moment it was published in the Official Gazette as thereupon the notified land became vested in the State Government free from all encumbrances. It was not necessary for the respondents to plead the service of notice on them by the Special Officer, Town Planning Department, Jaipur under s. 52 (2) for the grant of an appropriate writ, direction or order under Art. 226 of the Constitution for quashing the notification issued under s. 52 (1). If the respondents felt aggrieved by the acquisition of their lands at Jaipur and wanted to challenge the validity of the impugned notification issued by the State Government of Rajasthan under s. 52 (1), by a petition under Art. 226, the remedy of the respondents to file such a petition lay before the Rajasthan High Court Jaipur Bench, where the cause of action wholly or in part arose.”

5. *Per contra*, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Bank submits that the entire cause of action has arisen at Delhi, therefore, the writ petition is not maintainable before territorial jurisdiction of this Court. The learned counsel for the respondent Bank relies on a judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India in **Appeal (civil) No.1426 of 2007 (Alchemist Limited and Another vs. State Bank of Sikkim and Others)**, whereby vide judgment dated 16.03.2007, the Hon’ble Supreme Court of India after considering the issue of maintainability has held as follows:





“From the aforesaid discussion and keeping in view the ratio laid down in catena of decisions by this Court, it is clear that for the purpose of deciding whether facts averred by the petitioner\027 appellant, would or would not constitute a part of cause of action, one has to consider whether such fact constitutes a material, essential, or integral part of the cause of action. It is no doubt true that even if a small fraction of the cause of action arises within the jurisdiction of the Court, the Court would have territorial jurisdiction to entertain the suit/petition. Nevertheless it must be a ‘part of cause of action’, nothing less than than.

In the present case, the facts which have been pleaded by the Appellant Company, in our judgment, cannot be said to be essential, integral or material facts so as to constitute a part of ‘cause of action’ within the meaning of Article 226(2) of the Constitution. The High Court, in our opinion, therefore, was not wrong in dismissing the petition.

For the foregoing reasons, we see no infirmity in the order passed by the High Court dismissing the petition on the ground of want of territorial jurisdiction. The appeal, therefore, deserves to be dismissed and is accordingly dismissed. In the facts and circumstances of the case, however, we leave the parties to bear their own costs.”

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and after going through the documents and records as well as the judgments provided by the learned counsel for the parties, it appears that the judgment relied upon by the petitioner of the





Rajasthan High Court is not supporting the case of the petitioner, rather it is in favour of the Bank and further in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in the case of Alchemist Limited (*supra*), this Court is of the view that cause of action has not arisen before the territorial jurisdiction of this Court.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed for want of territorial jurisdiction.

(Ritesh Kumar, J.)

Sanjay/-

U			
---	--	--	--

