

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CIVIL APPEAL NO.                      OF 2025  
(Arising out of SLP(C) Nos. 35933-35934 of 2016)

STATE BANK OF INDIA ETC.

Appellant(s)

VERSUS

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA & ORS.

Respondent(s)

O R D E R

1. Leave granted.

2. These appeals challenge the judgment and order dated 12.12.2013 passed by the Division Bench of the High Court of Guwahati in suo moto public interest litigation being PIL (Suo Moto) No. 4 of 2013 and the judgment and order dated 28.07.2016 passed by the Division Bench of the High Court of Guwahati in Review Petition No. 51 of 2014.

3. The High Court took suo moto cognizance of a newspaper report appearing in 'Assam Tribune Daily' on 14.12.2012 wherein a news article was published which reported that when a consumer had withdrawn an amount of Rs. 5,000/- from the ATM, it was found that another amount of Rs.35,000/- was fraudulently withdrawn from his account after he left the ATM.

4. The High Court in the order dated 12.12.2013 passed a slew of directions, including round-the-clock surveillance of all ATMs, both physical and electronic, designation of nodal officer by each bank for liasoning with the police, among others, to prevent the occurrence of such incidents.

5. Subsequently, on a Review Petition being filed by 15 banks challenging the direction to place security guards round the clock at all ATMs, the High Court in the order dated 28.07.2016 modified the direction to the extent that the requirement of placing security guards would be limited to the period of time when the ATMs are open, among other directions.

6. Being aggrieved by the said direction to place security guards at all ATMs, these appeals have been filed.

7. Shri Tushar Mehta, learned Solicitor General appearing for the appellant(s) submits that the appellants have no grievance to accept the other directions, except direction No.(i) which reads thus:-

“(i) Place security guards round the clock

at all ATMS so that proper queues are enforced and to ensure that only one customer can enter for one ATM, at a time."

8. It is submitted that in the State of Assam itself, there are around 4,000 ATMs and it is not feasible to implement such a massive direction.

9. The respondents, who have put in appearance, do not oppose the setting aside of the said direction.

10. In that view of the matter, the appeals are allowed. The direction No. (i) issued in order dated 12.12.2013 passed by the Division Bench of the High Court is quashed and set aside.

11. Pending application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of.

.....J  
(B.R. GAVAI)

.....J  
(K. VINOD CHANDRAN)

New Delhi  
February 11, 2025

ITEM NO.3

COURT NO.2

SECTION XIV

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

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (C) No(s). 35933-35934/2016

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 12-12-2013 in PIL No. 4/2013 28-07-2016 in RP No. 51/2014 passed by the Gauhati High Court]

STATE BANK OF INDIA ETC.

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA &amp; ORS.

Respondent(s)

(IA No. 1/2016 - CONDONATION OF DELAY IN FILING)

Date : 11-02-2025 This matter was called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE B.R. GAVAI

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. VINOD CHANDRAN

For Petitioner(s) :

Mr. Tushar Mehta, Solicitor General  
Mr. Sanjay Kapur, AOR  
Mr. Surya Prakash, Adv.  
Ms. Shubhra Kapur, Adv.  
Ms. Mahima Kapur, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Bijoy Kumar Jain, AOR

Mr. Brijender Chahar, A.S.G.  
Mr. Rajeshwari Shankar, Adv.  
Ms. Vimla Sinha, Adv.

Mr. Brijesh Kumar Tamber, AOR

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

1. Leave granted.
2. The appeals are allowed in terms of the signed order.
3. Pending application(s), if any, stand(s) disposed of.

(DEEPAK SINGH)

ASTT. REGISTRAR-cum-PS

(ANJU KAPOOR)

COURT MASTER (NSH)

[Signed order is placed on the file]