

ORDER SHEET

WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

Present-

The Hon'ble Mrs. Urmita Datta (Sen), Member (J)

The Hon'ble Dr. Subesh Kumar Das, Member (A)

Case No – **OA 725 of 2017**

Ranjit Kumar Roy Vs The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Serial No. and Date of order. 1	Order of the Tribunal with signature 2	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary 3
11 04.12.2020	<p>For the Applicant : Mrs. S. Agarwal, Ld. Advocate. For the Respondent : Mr. S.N. Ray, Ld. Advocate.</p> <p>Vakalatnama filed on behalf of the applicant be kept on record.</p> <p>The instant application has been filed being aggrieved with the order dated 09.08.2016, which is as follows :</p> <p>“In connection with the subject and reference cited above, I am directed to inform you that the Department could not recommend the matter as a fit case for appointment on compassionate ground in terms of the Notification No. 26-Emp. Dated 01.03.2016 of Labour Department, Government of West Bengal.”</p> <p>Subsequently, the applicant also asked for some information under RTI, which was replied vide communication dated 16.11.2016 (Annexure P). As per the applicant, on perusal of the impugned order dated 09.08.2016, it would be evident that no specific reasons for rejection has been assigned while rejecting the claim of the applicant. Therefore, on the above ground only the impugned order should be quashed and set aside. Counsel for the applicant also submits that it would suffice his purpose if the respondents would be directed to consider his case again by way of passing a reasoned and</p>	

ORDER SHEET

Ranjit Kumar Roy

Form No.

.....

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

.....

Case No. **OA 725 OF 2017**

SS	<p>speaking order by quashing the impugned order dated 09.08.2016 within a stipulated period of time.</p> <p>Counsel for the respondents has no objection.</p> <p>We have heard the parties and perused the records specifically the impugned order dated 09.08.2016. In our considered opinion, the abovementioned order dated 09.08.2016 is non-speaking one. Therefore, we remand the case to the respondent no. 1 to revisit his case and communicate the final decision by way of reasoned and speaking order within a period of 6 (six) weeks from the date of receipt of this order.</p> <p>Accordingly, the OA is disposed of.</p> <p>SUBESH KUMAR DAS MEMBER(A)</p> <p>URMITA DATTA (SEN) MEMBER (J)</p>	
----	---	--