



109

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CWP-38097-2025 (O&M)  
Date of decision: 16.07.2026**

**MANJEET**

**..Petitioner**

**Versus**

**THE INSTITUTE OF BANKING PERSONNEL  
SELECTION IBPS AND ORS**

**..Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SUDEEPTI SHARMA**

Present: Mr. Mohit Malik, Advocate (through v.c.)  
for the petitioner.

Dr. Anmol Rattan Sidhu, Sr. Advocate  
with Mr. Shiv Kumar Sharma, Advocate  
Mr. R.N. Lohan, Advocate  
Mr. Ajay K. Yadav, Advocate  
for respondent No.1-IBPS.

Mr. Anshul Pareek, Advocate  
for Mr. Saurav Verma, Advocate  
for respondent No.2.

**SUDEEPTI SHARMA, J. (Oral)**

1. The present writ petition has been filed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India for issuance of a writ in the nature of certiorari or mandamus or any other appropriate writ, orders, direction as deem proper by this Hon'ble high court for restoring original notification dated 01.08.25 (Annexure P1), quashing revised notification dt 27.10.25 (Annexure P4) and for restraining respondents from proceeding with the recruitment process for Chandigarh till the ESM vacancies are restored or alternative relief is provided to the petitioner.



2. Learned counsel for respondent contends that the present writ petition is not maintainable against IBPS in view of the judgment passed by Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Rajbir Surajbhan Singh Vs. chairman, Institute of Banking Personnel Selection, Mumbai, Law Finder Doc Id #1443282.**

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner is unable to dispute the same.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case file with their able assistance.

5. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Rajbir Surajbhan Singh Vs. chairman, Institute of Banking Personnel Selection, Mumbai, Law Finder Doc Id #1443282** has held as under:-

*“8. It is true that the Governor of the Reserve Bank of India and the Chairmen of certain Public Sector Banks along with the Joint Secretary, Banking Division, Ministry of Finance are members of the governing body of the Respondent-Institute. There is no dispute that the Respondent is not constituted under a statute. It is also not disputed that the Respondent does not receive any funds from the Government. The Respondent is not controlled by the Government. The letter dated 20.09.2010 produced by the Appellant along with the rejoinder affidavit does not show deep and pervasive control by the Government of India. The question of whether the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research fell under 'other authorities' within the meaning of Article 12 was referred to a 7 Judge Bench of this Court. [See: Pradeep Kumar Biswas v. Indian Institute of Chemical Biology and Others. (supra)]. Resolving the dispute, the 7 Judge Bench in Pradeep Kumar Biswas (supra) held that the question as to whether a corporation/society would fall within the meaning of Article 12 should be decided after examining whether the*



*body is financially, functionally and administratively dominated by or under the control of the Government. This Court observed that such control should be particular to the body in question and must be pervasive. A control which is merely regulatory under the statute or otherwise would not make the body 'State' under Article 12. As there is no control by the Government over the Respondent in the manner mentioned above, we have no doubt in our mind that the Respondent cannot be said to be falling within the expression 'State' under Article 12 of the Constitution of India.”*

6. In view of the above, the present writ petition is dismissed as not maintainable.

7. All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, are also disposed of.

**July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2026**

*Ayub/Sahil*

**(SUDEEPTI SHARMA)  
JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned* : *Yes/No*  
*Whether reportable* : *Yes/No*