

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON

&

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DEVAN RAMACHANDRAN

WEDNESDAY, THE 23RD DAY OF JANUARY 2019 / 3RD MAGHA, 1940

RP.No. 64 of 2019 IN WA. 800/2018

AGAINST THE JUDGMENT IN WA 800/2018 DATED 29.08.2018

REVIEW PETITIONER/S:

M.SASEENDRAN, AGED 54 YEARS  
SIVAGIRI MUTT, VARKALA, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.

BY ADVS.  
SHRI.K.NIRMALAN  
SRI.V.JAYADHAR

RESPONDENT/S:

- 1 THE MANAGING DIRECTOR,  
STATE BANK OF TRAVANCORE, POOJAPPURA,  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM. NOW STATE BANK OF INDIA,  
CORPORATE CENTRE, STATE BANK BHAVAN, BACK BAY  
RECLAMATION, NARIMAN POINT, MUMBAI, PIN-400021.
- 2 THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,  
KOLLAM-691001.

R1 BY SRI.P.RAMAKRISHNAN

THIS REVIEW PETITION HAVING BEEN FINALLY HEARD ON 23.01.2019, THE  
COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

**ORDER**

Devan Ramachandran, J

This review petition has been filed by the petitioner apprehending that inspite of our directions in the judgment in W.A No.800 of 2018 dated 29.08.2018, wherein we had granted him liberty to file a representation before the respondent to seek all eligible benefits, including gratuity, it will be denied to him because of our observations in paragraph nineteen of the said judgment. The petitioner says that he has approached the competent authorities of the Bank, without making a representation as directed by us; but he was given to understand that in view of our findings in paragraph 19 of the judgment, he will not be given any benefit including gratuity. It is on such basis that he has

filed this review petition.

2. It is indubitable that going by the pleadings on record, specially in the review petition, our jurisdiction to review our own judgment cannot be invoked in this manner or for the reasons stated therein. Obviously the conjectural apprehension of the petitioner that he may not be given any benefits, inspite of our directions in the judgment, is certainly not a ground that can be invoked for review of our judgment.

3. That said, however, we are certain in our mind that when we delivered our judgment, which is now sought to be reviewed in this petition, we wanted the Bank to consider the claim of the petitioner in its proper perspective, including as to whether the persons who have been found guilty along with him were

given any such benefits.

In other words, we certainly were of the opinion, though not specifically mentioned in the judgment, that if the co-accused have been given any benefits, inspite of the fact that their services were also terminated like the petitioner, then similar benefits also ought to be given to the petitioner based on his representation to be made pursuant to the judgment in W.A No.800/2018.

With these observations, we close this review petition.

**Sd/-**

**P.R.RAMACHANDRA MENON**

**JUDGE**

**Sd/-**

**DEVAN RAMACHANDRAN**

**JUDGE**

SB/25/01/2019