



ALL INDIA STATE BANK OFFICERS' FEDERATION



(Registered under the Trade Unions Act 1926, Registration No: 727/MDS)

Central Office: State Bank Buildings, St. Mark's Road, Bangalore-560 001
Registered Office: 22, Rajaji Salai, Chennai- 600 001

CIRCULAR NO. 58/2026

Date: 18/05/2026

TO ALL OUR AFFILIATES

Anomalies Observed in the Annual Inter-Circle Transfer (ICT) Exercise 2026 Request for Reconsideration, Restoration of Seniority and Publication of a Supplementary List.

We have sent a communication to the Deputy Managing Director (HR) & Corporate Development Officer, State Bank of India, Corporate Centre, Mumbai-400021, on the captioned subject.

The content of the communication is reproduced below.

With Greetings,

Yours Comradely,

(Rupam Roy)
General Secretary

Letter No.6453/15/2026

DATE: 18.05.2026

The Deputy Managing Director (HR) & CDO
State Bank of India
Corporate Centre,
Mumbai – 400021

Dear Sir,

Subject: Anomalies Observed in the Annual Inter-Circle Transfer (ICT) Exercise 2026 Request for Reconsideration, Restoration of Seniority and Publication of a Supplementary List.

We invite your kind and considered attention to the recently published Annual Inter-Circle Transfer (ICT) Exercise 2026 for General Cadre Officers (up to the grade of MMGS-III), wherein several avoidable anomalies and grievances have been brought to our notice by our affiliates from various Circles. The present representation respectfully seeks reconsideration of the exercise and the publication of a supplementary list to afford respite to officers whose genuine, long-pending and constitutionally protected entitlements have not been honoured.

While we sincerely acknowledge the Bank's efforts to accommodate a sizeable number of aspirants seeking inter-circle transfer, we observe with deep concern that, despite numerous representations from the Federation, a significant number of officers with genuine and compelling requirements, many awaiting transfer for periods ranging from seven to nine years, have once again been left

out. The grievances received from across the Circles disclose systemic issues touching upon principles of constitutional equality, settled service jurisprudence, the Bank's own published norms and binding directives of the Government of India. The detailed list of representations received from different Circles is appended herewith as **Annexure-I**, highlighting the anomalies and seeking redressal at your end.

Specific Anomalies Observed in the ICT 2026 Exercise

(a) Non-materialisation of transfer despite top position in the Waiting List:

Several officers placed at Sl. No. 1 in the published waiting list, both under the spouse-ground and other-ground categories, have not been considered for transfer, while juniors placed lower in the list have been favourably considered. Once the Bank has itself prepared and published a sequenced waiting list, any departure therefrom without recorded reasons is the very disruption that the doctrine of non-arbitrariness seeks to eliminate.

(b) Adverse impact of JIBO application on pending ICT requests: A significant number of officers have reported that their long-pending ICT applications stood automatically cancelled on account of their having applied for the JIBO 2026 exercise. These officers were neither selected for JIBO nor considered for ICT, leaving them in a schizophrenic condition despite years of waiting. This very act of disfavour contradicts Clause 5(v) of the Placement Norms of the JIBO Notification dated 20.02.2026, which expressly provides that *“Further, ICT applications under pipeline, if any, shall stand cancelled for selected candidates. However, the officers can apply for ICT once again, upon repatriation from their respective foreign assignments. Their seniority will be reckoned from the date of fresh application (post foreign posting) only.”* By extending the cancellation clause to non-selected officers, the Bank has obliterated the very protection consciously incorporated by it in the declared policy.

(c) Near-total neglect of the “Others” ground category: Across multiple Circles, officers applying under the “Others” ground category have been virtually excluded from the published list, with selections being almost entirely confined to the spouse ground. In several Circles, there has been little or no movement in the “Others” category for the past two to three years, despite officers having served at the same Circle for eight to nine years and beyond. While the Federation respects the prioritisation of spouse-ground cases, the total exclusion of an entire policy-recognised category renders the “Others” head illusory and unworkable. The Bank's own ICT policy, by recognising the “Others” head, has created a corresponding legitimate expectation that genuine cases under that head shall be addressed within a reasonable cycle.

(d) Inconsistencies in spouse-ground verification: Multiple anomalies have surfaced under the spouse-ground head, including:

(i) Applications rejected on the ground that the spouse's employer is not a “listed” private company: The test of “listing” is not a recognised criterion under the DoPT OMs and disproportionately prejudices officers whose spouses are employed in legitimately incorporated but unlisted companies, LLPs and partnership firms. Such a criterion is not anchored in any published norm.

(ii) Cases where both husband and wife are SBI employees yet ICT has not been granted, while juniors whose spouses work in other organisations have been transferred. This is in direct conflict with the judgement in *Bank of India v. Jagjit Singh Mehta (supra)*, wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court held

that the spouse-together-posting principle applies with even greater force when both spouses are employees of the same Bank.

(iii) Where one spouse is in the clerical cadre (post-2020 joiner) and the other is an Officer, the Officer has been transferred but the clerical spouse has been left behind on the ground that post-2020 clerical recruits are not eligible for ICT. This defeats the very purpose of the transfer and works at cross-purposes to the DoPT OM dated 24.11.2022, which explicitly calls for joint posting of spouses including across cadres, in the interest of family welfare and care of children below 18 years of age. Where the spouse left behind is a female employee, the matter is governed additionally by DFS Letter F.No. 4/9/1/2014-IR dated 08.08.2014, which directs PSBs to accommodate her placement, on her request, at her husband's station "*or as near as possible to that place or vice versa*".

(iv) Genuine cases involving small children below the age of 18 and dependent elderly parents have not been accorded due weightage, in derogation of the said OM and Section 4 of the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007.

(v) The OM dated 24.11.2022 further mandates that where one spouse belongs to a Central Service/PSB and the other to a PSU, the PSU spouse "*may apply to the competent authority and the said authority may post the officer to the station or, if there is no post under the PSU in that station, to the station nearest to the station where the other spouse is posted*". This salutary direction is being administered with marked inconsistency across Circles.

The cumulative effect is a non-uniform application of policy across the Bank, a state of affairs squarely deprecated in *Maneka Gandhi (supra)* and *Bhupendra Nath Hazarika v. State of Assam*, (2013) 2 SCC 516.

(e) Hardship arising out of the revised eligibility norms: The recent revision of the ICT eligibility norms, by extending the minimum service requirement, has caused undue hardship to officers who were on the verge of becoming eligible under the earlier norms. In one such illustrative case, an officer of the 2019 PO Batch could not apply in January 2025 due to a documented technical glitch in the SMART Portal (a circumstance attributable to the Bank), and is now considered ineligible till 2027 under the revised norms, while batch-mates who applied on time have been transferred. Similarly, officers who joined as Junior Associates and were subsequently promoted to Trainee Officer are being subjected to a fresh circle service period, ignoring their entire prior service in the same Circle. The principle of legitimate expectation also operates in their favour. A transitional relief is therefore necessary.

(f) Compassionate and medical cases, denial of empathetic consideration: The following cases, all duly verifiable, have not been accorded the empathy and priority that the law commands:

- (i) An officer awaiting corneal transplantation with verified visual impairment.
- (ii) An officer who has undergone liver transplantation and requires continuous post-operative care.
- (iii) An officer whose spouse is undergoing cancer treatment.
- (iv) An officer with a mentally challenged sibling as sole care-giver.
- (v) An officer whose father has locomotor disability and whose brother has met with a major accident.

(vi) Several officers with aged and ailing parents with no alternate care arrangement.

Each of these cases attracts the protective umbrella of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (Sections 3, 20 and 33), the DoPT OM dated 31.03.2014 read with OM dated 08.10.2018, the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 (Section 4), and the dignified-family-life guarantee under Article 21 as expounded in *Bhagwan Dass (supra)* and *Net Ram Yadav (supra)*. We earnestly request that these cases be revisited individually with a humane, statute-compliant approach.

(g) Inordinately long-pending cases: Many officers have been awaiting inter-circle transfer for periods ranging from seven to nine years, with applications dating back to 2017 and 2018. Continued dislocation from family, ailing parents and dependents has taken a heavy toll on personal lives and workplace performance. A one-time review of such long-pending cases, with a sympathetic approach, would restore institutional morale and confidence in the transfer mechanism.

Equity in Inter-Circle Transfer of SMGS-IV & SMGS-V Officers

We also reiterate our earlier representations regarding the need to bring equity to the Inter-Circle Transfer of SMGS-IV and SMGS-V officers. Officers repatriated to their home Circle after a long outside tenure are once again being subjected to transfer within a span of three to four years of stay at the Circle, while several others who are senior in terms of Circle stay continue to remain undisturbed. We once again propose the adoption of a “First-In-First-Out” (FIFO) principle for officers who have rejoined the Circle on repatriation, so as to ensure equitable sharing of conveniences and inconveniences and to prevent the perception of arbitrariness that specifically forbids. Compassionate considerations, family compulsions, children's education and continuity in elder-care, being indispensable for an officer to plan and excel both at the family front and in workplace performance, deserve due weight in such decisions.

In view of the foregoing constitutional, statutory and administrative considerations, we earnestly request your good office to kindly:

- (a) Publish a Supplementary List of Inter-Circle Transfer orders, incorporating those genuine aspirants whose names have been omitted despite topping the waiting list or having compelling compassionate grounds.
- (b) Restore the seniority of those officers who had applied for ICT but their applications were kept in abeyance considering the fact that they had also applied for JIBO but ultimately were not selected. Such ICT applications should be taken into cognizance while ascertaining the seniority in terms of eligibility in conformity with the Clause 5(v) of the JIBO Notification dated 20.02.2026 and in justification of the doctrine of legitimate expectation.
- (c) Adopt a holistic developmental approach to facilitate child-care opportunity, family welfare, women's safety and care-giver responsibility towards elderly dependents.
- (d) Ensure proportionate representation of the “Others” ground category in every ICT cycle, with a published explanatory note where the proportion falls below a reasonable threshold.

- (e) Revisit the recently revised eligibility norms with a view to providing transitional relief to (i) officers who were on the verge of eligibility under the earlier norms, particularly those prejudiced by the documented SMART Portal glitch of January 2025, and (ii) officers whose service as Junior Associate in the same Circle ought to be reckoned for ICT eligibility upon their promotion as Trainee Officer.
- (f) Exempt officers facing severe medical or family hardship, including those with benchmark disabilities or those acting as care-givers to persons with benchmark disabilities, from involuntary dislocation, and reconsider, with empathy and statutory compliance, the cases enumerated in the aforementioned annexure.
- (g) Adopt the First-In-First-Out principle for SMGS-IV and SMGS-V repatriated officers, supported by an objective scoring matrix on circle stay, family compulsions and prior outside tenure.

We are confident that the Bank, with its long-standing tradition of being a caring and constitutionally compliant model employer, shall give due consideration to this humble submission and provide the much-needed relief to the affected officers. Your kind intervention in the matter shall be deeply appreciated by the entire fraternity of officers across the country.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,

Sd/-
(Rupam Roy)
General Secretary

Encl.: *Annexure-I (Circle-wise list of representations) as above*

At the Service of Members for more than 6 Decades

General Secretary: +91-9957563825
Camp Office – State Bank of India, Local Head Office, Dispur, Guwahati, Assam-781006
Email: aisbofbangalore@gmail.com Web: www.aisbof.org