

WPA 15369 of 2026

Sri Tutiki Sudhir
Vs.
Indian Bank & Ors.

Mr. Amales Ray, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Mousumi Bhowal
Mr. Aman Gupta
Mr. Ishan Bhattacharya
..... for the petitioner

Mr. Shiv Mangal Singh
.....for the Indian Bank

1. Let affidavit-of-service, as filed in Court, be kept on record.
2. The petitioner, an employee of the Indian Bank, has been subjected to a disciplinary proceeding by the concerned authorities of the Bank. The disciplinary authority has passed its order on May 5, 2025, which was carried in appeal by the petitioner to the Appellate Authority. The Appellate Authority had disposed of the appeal by its order dated September 9, 2025.
3. However, after the order of the Appellate Authority was passed, the petitioner had occasion to find further relevant documents, which was not available to the petitioner at the time of disciplinary proceedings and the appellate proceedings.
4. This prompted the petitioner to file a review application before the Appellate Authority on

November 15, 2025 which was duly served by electronic mail. The petitioner seeks to rely upon certain additional documents which are fairly voluminous before the Reviewing Authority. The Reviewing Authority has not yet disposed of the matter and the same is pending since November, 2025.

5. In terms of the Indian Bank Officer Employees' (Discipline & Appeal) Regulations, 1976, the petitioner has a right of review which is further amplified by the Rules applicable for review.

6. In view of the applicable Rules which give a right to the petitioner to seek review of such order passed by the Appellate Authority, I direct the respondent no. 3, the Reviewing Authority, to dispose of the review application of the petitioner by November 30, 2026 by passing a reasoned order. Since there are voluminous documents, the petitioner will be entitled to a hearing before the Reviewing Authority either by himself or through his authorized representative. The Reviewing Authority will dispose of the matter taking into account and deciding on the issue of admissibility of such documents, which the petitioner seeks to rely upon.

7. With the aforestated directions, the writ petition is disposed of.

8. Since no affidavits have been called for, the allegations contained in the writ petition are deemed to be denied by the respondents.

9. There will be no order as to costs.

10. Urgent photostat certified copy of the order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon usual undertakings.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)