

j# ITEM NO.1

COURT NO.5

SECTION IV

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F
RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

I N D I A

I.A. 2/2014 in Civil Appeal

No(s). 172/2010

STATE BANK OF PATIALA

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

PRITAM SINGH BEDI & ORS.

Respondent(s)

(For clarification/modification of court's order)

WITH

I.A. 2/2014 in C.A. No. 173/2010

(With appln.(s) for clarification/modification of court's order)

I.A. 2/2014 in C.A. No. 177/2010

(With appln.(s) for clarification/modification of court's order

and)

I.A. 2/2014 in C.A. No. 178/2010

(With appln.(s) for clarification/modification of court's order)

I.A. 2/2014 in C.A. No. 179/2010

(With appln.(s) for clarification/modification of court's order)

I.A. 2/2014 in C.A. No. 180/2010

(With appln.(s) for clarification/modification of court's order

and Office Report)

I.A. 2/2014 in C.A. No. 186/2010

(With appln.(s) for clarification/modification of court's order)

I.A. 2/2014 in C.A. No. 187/2010

(With appln.(s) for clarification/modification of court's order)

I.A. 1 in C.A. No. 1916/2011

(With appln.(s) for clarification/modification of court's order

and Interim Relief and Office Report)

Date : 05/09/2014 This application was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHANSU JYOTI MUKHOPADHAYA

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRAFULLA CHANDRA PANT

For Appellant(s)

Mr. Ranjit Kumar, SG

Mr. Sanjay Kapur, Adv.

Signature Not Verified

Digitally signed by

Ms. Priyanka Das, Adv.

Neeta Sapra

Date: 2014.09.06

13:03:25 IST

Mr. Anmol Chandan, Adv.

Reason:

Ms. Shubhra Kapur, Adv.

-2-

For Respondent(s)

Dr. Kailash Chand, Adv.

Mr. R.S. Kataria, Adv.

Mr. S.K. Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Balbir Singh Gupta, Adv.

Mr. Pankaj Kumar Singh, Adv.

Mr. Satpal Singh, Adv.

Mr. Nishe Rajen Shonker, Adv.
Ms. Anu K. Joy, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

In order dated 7th July, 2014 this Court at paragraphs 23 and 24 made following observations:

"23. It has not been disputed by appellant-Bank that the respondents in all the appeals have completed much more than 19 years 6 months of service in the Bank. For example, respondent No.1-Prakash Chand in C.A. No.173 of 2010 had joined the Bank on 4th May, 1981 and relieved on 31st March, 2001. Thus, he had completed 19 years, 10 months and 28 days of qualifying service on the date of relieving from service.

24. Regulation 18 of the Pension Regulations, 1995 provides that if broken period is more than six months, it shall be treated as one year. Therefore, all the respondents-writ petitioners having completed more than 19 years and 6 months of service in the Bank, they are to be treated to have completed 20 years of service. The aforesaid question was neither raised nor decided in the case of 'Bank of Baroda' or 'Bank of India'."

In view of such finding already given no further clarification is required. If there is any error apparent it will be open to the bank to file a petition for review of the order.

-3-

However, liberty aforesaid can not be relied upon to suggest that we have expressed any opinion about the judgment in question.

I.A. No. 1 in C.A. No. 1916 of 2011 and I.A. No. 2 in C.A. Nos. 172, 173, 177-180, 186 and 187 of 2010 stand disposed of.

(Neeta)
Sr. P.A.

(Usha Sharma)
COURT MASTER