

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4930 OF 2014
[ARISING OUT OF S.L.P. (C) NO. 18044 OF 2013]

STATE BANK OF PATIALA ... APPELLANT(s)

Versus

M.P. JINDAL AND OTHERS ... RESPONDENT(s)

O R D E R

Leave granted.

2. The controversy in the present matter is concluded by the decision of this Court in State Bank of India and another vs. Mohammed Abdul Rahim1 wherein this Court has held that in a matter where the delinquent has been dismissed on the ground of a criminal prosecution and convicted by the trial court, on reversal of conviction by the appellate court and the delinquent being acquitted, the subsequent acquittal though obliterates his conviction, but does not operate retrospectively to wipe out legal consequences of the conviction under the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (for short "1949 Act") and consequently the delinquent is not entitled to back wages from the date of dismissal until reinstatement. Section 10(1)(b)(i) of the

1 (2013)11 SCC 67

2

1949 Act having been construed as above by this Court, the respondent No. 1 is not entitled to back wages. Consequently, civil appeal is allowed and the order of the High Court with regard to award of back wages is set-aside. No costs.

.....CJI.
(R.M. LODHA)

