

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G SCivil Appeal No(s). 8877/2022

GUMAN SINGH

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

GENERAL MANAGER/NETWORK11/LOCAL HEAD OFFICE,
STATE BANK OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

Hearing expedited vide Hon'ble Court's order dated 07.11.2022.
IA No. 97701/2022 - APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION
IA No. 30250/2021 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING AFFIDAVIT
IA No. 101360/2022 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING AFFIDAVIT

Date : 18-06-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE
HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE V. MOHANA

(PARTIAL COURT WORKING DAYS BENCH)

For Appellant(s) : Petitioner-in-person

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Sanjay Kapur, AOR

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following

O R D E R

1. The appellant was serving as a Scale-III officer in the State Bank of India when a case was registered against him by the Central Bureau of Investigation under the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (for short, the "Act") on the basis of an allegation that he illegally demanded gratification of Rs.5,000/- from an account-holder. The appellant faced trial in Special Case No. 13/2009 and was convicted by the Special Judge vide judgment dated 27.01.2014 under Sections 7 and 13(1)(d) read with Section 13(2) of the Act. Owing to his conviction, he was discharged from service with effect from 21.10.2014. Against this order of conviction, the appellant

filed an appeal before the High Court, which was allowed *vide* judgment dated 20.04.2017, and consequently, he was acquitted of the criminal charges. Thereafter, he applied to the Bank for reinstatement in service and his request was accepted *vide* order dated 12.09.2017, subject to the condition that he will not claim arrears of back wages and other service benefits for the period he remained out of service. The appellant challenged his conditional reinstatement before the High Court, but his writ petition, review petition, and writ appeal were dismissed. Aggrieved by this, the appellant has approached this Court.

2. During the course of hearing, the appellant, who appears in person, has referred to a document dated 15.11.1999, which appears to be a letter issued by the respondent-Bank with respect to one H.C. Phulwali, who was also an employee of the Bank and was acquitted by the High Court in the same criminal case. The letter suggests that his claim for payment of salary for the period he remained out of service and the period during which he was removed from service was ordered to be treated as 'on duty', and consequently, arrears were paid to him.

3. We direct the learned counsel for the Bank to verify the factum regarding the instance relied upon by the appellant and to try to amicably resolve the issue regarding payment of arrears.

4. Post the matter on 22.08.2026 before Samadhan Samaroh, 2026.

(NITIN TALREJA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(PREETHI DILEEP KUMAR)
DEPUTY REGISTRAR