

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY  
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION (L) NO.4818 OF 2026

SATISH  
RAMCHANDRA  
SANGAR

Digitally signed by  
SATISH RAMCHANDRA  
SANGAR  
Date: 2026.03.24  
19:37:16 +0530

Rahul Sarjerao Devake

...Petitioner

V/s.

State Transport Co-operative Bank Ltd.  
Through General Manager and Anr.

...Respondents

\*\*\*\*\*

Mr.Pradyumna Sharma a/w Mr.Dujendrakumar Sharma,  
Mr.Randhirkumar Mandel and Ms.Bhavika Hodar, Advocates for  
Petitioner.

Dr.Gunratan Sadavarte a/w Dr.Jaishri Patil, Ms.Neelam Sawane and  
Mr.Kapil Anbhone, Advocates for Respondent No.1.  
Ms.Gauri Sawant, AGP, for Respondent No.2 – State.

\*\*\*\*\*

CORAM : S.M.MODAK AND  
SANDEEP V. MARNE, JJ.

DATE : 24<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2026

P. C. :-

1. By this Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the Petitioner challenges the order of suspension dated 25<sup>th</sup> April 2025 and the memorandum of charge sheet dated 10<sup>th</sup> September 2025.

2. We have heard Mr.Pradyumna Sharma, learned counsel appearing for the Petitioner and learned counsel Dr.Gunratan Sadavarte for the Respondent No.1–Bank.

3. The Petitioner has been placed under suspension by order dated 25<sup>th</sup> April 2025 in contemplation of initiation of disciplinary proceedings. There appears to be an error in indication of date from which the Petitioner is placed under suspension. The date of suspension is indicated as 25<sup>th</sup> March 2025 though the order is issued on 25<sup>th</sup> April 2025. The suspension order uses the word "आज" which shows that the date 25<sup>th</sup> March 2025 is merely a typographical mistake and the Petitioner is placed under suspension with effect from 25<sup>th</sup> April 2025. Therefore, contention raised on behalf of the Petitioner that suspension is ordered with retrospective effect is baseless.

4. So far as challenge of the Petitioner to the memorandum of charge sheet dated 10<sup>th</sup> September 2025 is concerned, it is contended that the charge is vague and cryptic and that the charge sheet does not contain statement of allegations of Respondent or the list of witnesses.

5. We have gone through the charges levelled against the Petitioner in the charge sheet dated 10<sup>th</sup> September 2025. In our view, the exact charge levelled against the Petitioner is clearly made out from the allegations indicated in the charge sheet. It cannot be contended that the Petitioner is not in a position to comprehend the exact nature of allegation levelled against him. In fact, the Petitioner has filed a

detailed reply to the charge sheet on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2025. In that representation, the Petitioner has not raised a complaint that he is unable to comprehend the exact nature of charge levelled against him. Far from raising the contention, the Petitioner has dealt with the merits of charges. He has requested for conduct of enquiry and for his exoneration. We are, therefore, not inclined to accept the objection of vagueness and in the charge sheet.

6. It is also contended on behalf of the Petitioner that though the charge sheet is issued on 10<sup>th</sup> September 2025, the departmental enquiry has not been commenced and on this count, the concerned charge sheet is also set aside. It is, however, observed that the Petitioner has submitted the reply to the charge sheet on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2025. It is argued on behalf of the Respondent-Bank that the Petitioner was repeatedly called for enquiry but he has sought adjournments. Mr.Sadavarte has placed on record copy of letter dated 10<sup>th</sup> March 2026 addressed by the Respondent Bank to the Petitioner which indicates that the Petitioner was summoned for enquiry on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2026. However, he requested for adjournment of the enquiry on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2026. Mr.Sadavarte points out that the next date of enquiry is fixed on 25<sup>th</sup> March 2026. We are, therefore, not inclined to accept

contention raised on behalf of the Petitioner that no enquiry has been conducted into the impugned memorandum of charge sheet. In our view, no case is made out for interference in the order of suspension or the memorandum of charge sheet. The Writ Petition is devoid of merits. It is dismissed without any order as to cost. It is, however, clarified that this Court has not gone into the allegations levelled against the Petitioner and the enquiry shall be conducted and completed without being influenced by the observations made in the order.

(SANDEEP V. MARNE, J.)

(S.M.MODAK, J.)