

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 S

SPECIAL LEAVE PETITION (CIVIL) Diary No(s).54136/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 30-04-2026 in WP No. 4806/2025 passed by the HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CIRCUIT BENCH AT KOLHAPUR]

THE ZONAL MANAGER, BANK OF INDIA

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

LAXMI MANIKRAO KAMBLE & ANR.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 275121/2026 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING

Date : 28-09-2026 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ MISRA
 HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIJAY BISHNOI

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Dhruv Mehta, Sr. Adv.
 Mr. Vipin Kumar Jai- 1576, AOR
 Mrs. Gurinder Jai, Adv.
 Ms. Sanjna Dua, Adv.

For Respondent(s) Mr. Dawneesh Shaktivats- 3483, AOR
 Mr. Mohd Yasin, Adv.
 Mr. Subhashchandra Pawar, Adv.
 Ms. Shobita Jadhav, Adv.
 Ms. Supriya Pawar, Adv.
 Mr. Ashish More, Adv.
 Mr. Aditya Kumar, Adv.
 Ms. Himanshi Mehta, Adv.
 Mr. Aman Sabir Saifi, Adv.
 Ms. Urvashi Bansal, Adv.
 Mr. Kaustubh Khera, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following
O R D E R

1. The submission on behalf of the petitioner is that a composite petition challenging the preliminary Award as well as the final Award is

maintainable; the Tribunal fell in error in observing that there were no documents or evidence to disclose that the domestic inquiry was fair and proper when from the own statement of the workman during cross examination, as would be evident from paragraph 18 thereof, an inquiry was conducted; besides, the petitioner in paragraph (p) had clearly disclosed that all the relevant documents pertaining to the inquiry were produced by the workman himself and, therefore, there was no justification to hold that the domestic inquiry was unfair. It has also been submitted that the charge was serious and there was no specific denial to the charge in as much as admittedly a sum of Rs.70,000/- was debited from the account of the drawer of the cheque when on the face of the cheque the amount mentioned was only Rs.50,000/-. In such circumstances the respondent-workman who was a cashier and holding a position of trust was visited with the punishment as would be warranted in the facts of the case. It has been submitted that both the Tribunal as well as the High Court fell in error in directing reinstatement with full back wages and benefit of continuity in service.

2. Delay in filing the special leave petition is condoned.

3. Issue notice, returnable in six weeks.

4. Notice on behalf of the respondent has been accepted by Mr. Dawneesh Shaktivats, AOR.

5. In the meantime, effect and operation of the impugned Award shall remain stayed.

(CHETAN ARORA)
ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(SAPNA BANSAL)
COURT MASTER (NSH)