WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

Present-

The Hon'ble Justice Soumitra Pal (Chairman) & The Hon'ble Mr. P. Ramesh Kumar (Administrative Member)

Case No - OA 954 OF 2017

SAROJ BISWAS \underline{Vs} The State of West Bengal & Ors.

| Serial No. and | Order of the Tribunal with signature | Office action with date and dated signature |
|----------------|---|---|
| Date of order. | 2 | of parties when necessary |
| 1 | | 3 |
| 5 | For the Applicant: Mr. S. Bhattacharjee | |
| 23.08.2018 | Mrs. Souparna Das | |
| | Advocate | |
| | For the Respondents: Mr. G.P. Banerjee | |
| | Advocate | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | In this application, the applicant, who had | |
| | applied in the year 2016, pursuant to an advertisement, for | |
| | the post of Officer-in-Charge of Korak Observation & | |
| | Juvenile Home for Neglected Boys, Jalpaiguri has | |
| | challenged the notification dated 30 th June, 2017, issued | |
| | by the District Magistrate & Chairperson, Selection | |
| | Committee, Jalpaiguri, the respondent No. 2 for filling up | |
| | the post of Officer-in-Charge on the ground that since the | |
| | first candidate who was selected pursuant to the | |
| | recruitment process initiated in the year 2016 had | |
| | resigned after joining and as the second empanelled | |
| | candidate had declined to join, as the applicant herein | |
| | stood third in the panel of 2016, he is entitled to be | |
| | appointed. | |
| | | |

| Serial No. and Order of the Tribunal with signature Date of order. 2 1 | Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary |
|--|---|
|--|---|

Prayer is that the respondents may be directed by appropriate order to allow the applicant to join the said post after setting aside the fresh notification for retirement dated 30th June, 2017 being annexure "P-6" to the original application.

Mr. S. Bhattacharjee, learned advocate for the applicant along with Mrs. S. Das, relying on the statements in the application submit that order may be passed on the respondents directing them to appoint the applicant as he stood third in the panel.

Mr. G.P. Banerjee, learned advocate for the State respondent submits that since admittedly the first applicant had joined and had thereafter resigned, the panel ceased to exist. Relying on the judgement of the Supreme Court in State of Punjab vs. Raghbir Chand Sharma: (2002) 1 SCC 113, particularly the law laid down in paragraph 4 thereof, it is submitted that since with the joining of the first empanelled candidate the panel prepared pursuant to the 2016 selection process has ceased to exist, this application has no merit.

Heard learned advocates for the parties. Admittedly pursuant to the notification dated 4th February, 2016 selection process was initiated for filling up the post of Officer-in-Charge of Korak Observation & Juvenile

| Date of order. 1 Home for Neglected Boys, Jalpaiguri. The applicant participated in the selection process. It is stated that he stood third. The first candidate admittedly had joined on 1st August, 2016. Thereafter he resigned on 12st February, 2017. We find, in view of the law laid down in the judgement in State of Punjab vs. Raghbir Chand Sharma and Another (Supra) the panel has ceased to exist and no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should be offered appointment either in the vacancy on account of subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel. The relevant portion of the said judgement is as follows: "With the appointment of the first candidate for the only post in respect of which the consideration came to be made and select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other vacancies arising subsequently" | Serial No. and Order of the Tribunal with signature Office action with date | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| Home for Neglected Boys, Jalpaiguri. The applicant participated in the selection process. It is stated that he stood third. The first candidate admittedly had joined on 1st August, 2016. Thereafter he resigned on 12th February, 2017. We find, in view of the law laid down in the judgement in State of Punjab vs. Raghbir Chand Sharma and Another (Supra) the panel has ceased to exist and no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should be offered appointment either in the vacancy on account of subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel. The relevant portion of the said judgement is as follows: "With the appointment of the first candidate for the only post in respect of which the consideration came to be made and select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | Order of the Tribunal with signature 2 | and dated signature of parties when necessary | | |
| participated in the selection process. It is stated that he stood third. The first candidate admittedly had joined on 1st August, 2016. Thereafter he resigned on 12st February, 2017. We find, in view of the law laid down in the judgement in State of Punjab vs. Raghbir Chand Sharma and Another (Supra) the panel has ceased to exist and no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should be offered appointment either in the vacancy on account of subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel. The relevant portion of the said judgement is as follows: "With the appointment of the first candidate for the only post in respect of which the consideration came to be made and select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | Home for Neglected Boys Jalnaiguri The applicant | 3 | | |
| stood third. The first candidate admittedly had joined on 1st August, 2016. Thereafter he resigned on 12th February, 2017. We find, in view of the law laid down in the judgement in State of Punjab vs. Raghbir Chand Sharma and Another (Supra) the panel has ceased to exist and no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should be offered appointment either in the vacaney on account of subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel. The relevant portion of the said judgement is as follows: "With the appointment of the first candidate for the only post in respect of which the consideration came to be made and select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | | | | |
| 1st August, 2016. Thereafter he resigned on 12th February, 2017. We find, in view of the law laid down in the judgement in State of Punjab vs. Raghbir Chand Sharma and Another (Supra) the panel has ceased to exist and no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should be offered appointment either in the vacancy on account of subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel. The relevant portion of the said judgement is as follows: "With the appointment of the first candidate for the only post in respect of which the consideration came to be made and select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | | | | |
| 2017. We find, in view of the law laid down in the judgement in State of Punjab vs. Raghbir Chand Sharma and Another (Supra) the panel has ceased to exist and no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should be offered appointment either in the vacancy on account of subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel. The relevant portion of the said judgement is as follows: "With the appointment of the first candidate for the only post in respect of which the consideration came to be made and select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | | | | |
| judgement in State of Punjab vs. Raghbir Chand Sharma and Another (Supra) the panel has ceased to exist and no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should be offered appointment either in the vacancy on account of subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel. The relevant portion of the said judgement is as follows: "With the appointment of the first candidate for the only post in respect of which the consideration came to be made and select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | | | | |
| and Another (Supra) the panel has ceased to exist and no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should be offered appointment either in the vacancy on account of subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel. The relevant portion of the said judgement is as follows: "With the appointment of the first candidate for the only post in respect of which the consideration came to be made and select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | | | | |
| one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should be offered appointment either in the vacancy on account of subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel. The relevant portion of the said judgement is as follows: "With the appointment of the first candidate for the only post in respect of which the consideration came to be made and select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | | | | |
| should be offered appointment either in the vacancy on account of subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel. The relevant portion of the said judgement is as follows: "With the appointment of the first candidate for the only post in respect of which the consideration came to be made and select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | | | | |
| account of subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel. The relevant portion of the said judgement is as follows: "With the appointment of the first candidate for the only post in respect of which the consideration came to be made and select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | | | | |
| from the panel. The relevant portion of the said judgement is as follows: "With the appointment of the first candidate for the only post in respect of which the consideration came to be made and select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | | | | |
| judgement is as follows: "With the appointment of the first candidate for the only post in respect of which the consideration came to be made and select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | | | | |
| "With the appointment of the first candidate for the only post in respect of which the consideration came to be made and select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | | | | |
| of the first candidate for the only post in respect of which the consideration came to be made and select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | | | | |
| post in respect of which the consideration came to be made and select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | "With the appointment | | | |
| consideration came to be made and select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | of the first candidate for the only | | | |
| select panel prepared, the panel ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | post in respect of which the | | | |
| ceased to exist and has outlived its utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | consideration came to be made and | | | |
| utility and, at any rate, no one else in the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | select panel prepared, the panel | | | |
| the panel can legitimately contend that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | ceased to exist and has outlived its | | | |
| that he should have been offered appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | utility and, at any rate, no one else in | | | |
| appointment either in the vacancy arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | the panel can legitimately contend | | | |
| arising on account of the subsequent resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | that he should have been offered | | | |
| resignation of the person appointed from the panel or any other | | appointment either in the vacancy | | | |
| from the panel or any other | | arising on account of the subsequent | | | |
| | | resignation of the person appointed | | | |
| vacancies arising subsequently" | | from the panel or any other | | | |
| | | vacancies arising subsequently" | | | |
| | | | | | |

| Serial No. and | Order of the Tribunal with signature | Office action with date |
|----------------|--|---------------------------|
| Date of order. | 2 | and dated signature |
| | 2 | of parties when necessary |
| 1 | | 3 |
| | Therefore, there is no merit in this application. | |
| SCN. | Hence, no order is passed in this application. The | |
| JUN. | application is dismissed. | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | (P. Ramesh Kumar) (Soumitra Pal) MEMBER (A) CHAIRMAN | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |