



2025:HHC:40429

IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA

CWP No.18427 of 2025

Date of Decision: 27.11.2025

Vikrant Sharma

.....Petitioner

Versus

Punjab National Bank & Anr.

.....Respondents

Coram

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sandeep Sharma, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?

For the Petitioner: Mr. B.L. Soni, Advocate.

For the respondents: Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate.

Sandeep Sharma, J. *(Oral)*

By way of instant petition, very innocuous prayer has been made on behalf of the petitioner seeking a direction to the respondents to pass a reasoned and speaking order in the appeal preferred by him against the order dated 30.11.2024 (Annexure P-1) issued by Disciplinary Authority, Zonal Manager, whereby major penalty came to be imposed upon the petitioner and he was downgraded from the post of JMG Scale-I to Clerical cadre, in terms of Regulation 4(g) of Punjab National Bank Officer Employees (D & A), Regulations 1977, with further direction that he will be placed at 4th step of Basic pay of clerical staff i.e. Rs.29,720/-.

2. Though being aggrieved with the aforesaid order dated 30.11.2024 (Annexure P-1) passed by the Disciplinary Authority, Zonal Manager, petitioner preferred appeal before Appellate authority,



but no order has been passed till date. It appears that appeal filed by the petitioner was barred by limitation, as such, vide order dated 20.09.2025 (Annexure P-4), petitioner was apprised upon his application filed under Right to Information Act i.e. Appeal being barred by limitation was dismissed.

3. In nutshell, grouse of the petitioner is that once he had filed appeal, may be barred by limitation, appellate authority was under an obligation to pass an order assigning reasons for not condoning the delay. However, in the instant case, till date no order has been passed, as a result thereof, petitioner is in lurch because in the absence of order, if any, passed by appellate authority, he cannot approach superior court of law. Mr. Arvind Sharma, Advocate, who has put in appearance on behalf of the respondents, though disputed aforesaid claim of the petitioner, but fairly states that in case, no speaking order has been passed, thereby rejecting the appeal filed by the petitioner on the ground of limitation, same shall be passed expeditiously.

4. In view of the above, this Court, without going into the merits of the case, deems it fit to dispose of the present petition with a direction to the appellate authority to consider and decide the appeal of the petitioner (Annexure P-2) expeditiously, preferably within four weeks from today. Needless to say, in the event of appeal being dismissed on the ground of limitation, appellate authority shall pass



speaking order, assigning therein reasons for not condoning the delay and in case delay is condoned, appeal shall be heard and decided on its merits. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

November 27, 2025

(sunil)

**(Sandeep Sharma),
Judge**