



Work is Worship

STATE BANK OF INDIA OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION (LUCKNOW CIRCLE)

Registered Under Trade Union Act 1926 Registration No. 9488 (U.P.)
(Affiliated to ALL INDIA STATE BANK OFFICERS' FEDERATION)
8th Floor, State Bank of India, Administrative Building, SBI LHO, Moti Mahal Marg, Hazratganj, Lucknow - 226 001

CIRCULAR NO. 32

DATE : - 25.11.2019

To All Comrades,

We reproduce hereunder the text of AISBOF Circular No. 108 dated 25.11.2019 contents of which are self-explanatory for information of the members.

(PAWAN KUMAR)
GENERAL SECRETARY

AISBOF Letter No.6466/66/19 Dated 15.11.2019 addressed to The Deputy General Manager (IR), State Bank of India, Corporate Centre, Madame Cama Road, Mumbai- 400 021

Dear Sir

DEPENDENCY – CHOOSING PARENTS OR PARENTS IN LAW

Keeping in view of the social responsibility, to remove gender bias and to provide employees the flexibility to take care of either parents or parent in-law, eligibility criteria were modified in X Bi-partite Settlement [Ref No. P&HRD. Sl. No: 368/2015 - 16 [Circular No: CDO/P&HRD-IR/24/2015 dated 26.06.2015]. We reproduce the relevant part of this circular hereunder:

(vii) Definition of Family:

For the purpose of medical facilities and for the purpose of leave fare concession, the expression family of an employee shall mean –

- The term wholly dependent family member shall mean such member of the family having a monthly income not exceeding ₹10,000/- p.m. the income of one of the parents exceeds ₹10,000/- p.m. or the aggregate income of both the parents exceeds ₹10,000/- p.m., both the parents shall not be considered as wholly dependent on the officer employee.
- A married female employee may include her natural parents or parents-in-law under the definition of family, but not both, provided that the parents/parents-in-law are wholly dependent on her.

****Note:** For the purpose of medical expenses reimbursement scheme, for all employees, any two of the dependent parents/ parents-in-law shall be covered.

2. However, we understand that the true spirit of the modifications is being rampantly misinterpreted by the operating functionaries across Circle. The following is clear from the revised definition of "Family" and the ****Note** thereto.

- Intent of the above revision is to provide opportunity/flexibility to take care of either parents or parents in law, based only on one aspect i.e. income criteria (not any other criteria like parents/in-laws have other earning sons/daughters as is being misinterpreted often)
- **Note** to definition makes it clear that for medical expenses reimbursement scheme "*for all employees*" any two dependents – either parents or parents in law shall be covered. The words "*all employees*", is ignored and there has been misinterpretation in implementation. It is emphatically clear that all the employees are eligible to choose either parents or parents-in-law.

3. This modification was brought in to recognize the independence and right of employees to take care of their parents or parents in law as per their necessity. It was a step towards gender equality and to remove bias; to provide an opportunity and flexibility to the employees to take care of parents/parent in-laws. This needs to be left to the independent decision of employees and not to be interfered with or misinterpreted.

4. We would be glad if you can issue the necessary clarifications instructions on this.

With regards,

Yours sincerely

Sd/-

(Soumya Datta)

General Secretary