

WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

Bikash Bhavan, Salt Lake, Kolkata – 700 091.

Present-

The Hon'ble Sayeed Ahmed Baba, Officiating Chairperson and Administrative Member

Case No. –OA-615 of 2024

PRABIR KUMAR ROY -- VERSUS – The State of West Bengal & Others.

Serial No. and Date of order	For the Applicant	:	Mr. Gaurav Haldar, Mrs. Priya Sasmal, Learned Advocates
	For the State Respondents	:	Mr. Sankha Ghosh, Learned Advocate
<u>06</u> 29.08.2025	For the Principal Accountant General (A&E), West Bengal	:	Mr. Biswanath Mitra, Departmental Representative

The matter is taken up by the Single Bench pursuant to the order contained in the Notification No.638-WBAT/2J-15/2016 (Pt.-II) dated 23rd November, 2022 issued in exercise of the powers conferred under section 5(6) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985.

In this application, the applicant has prayed for a direction to the respondent authorities to refund the overdrawn amount recovering from his retiring gratuity amounting to Rs. 6,01,069/- (Rupees Six lakh one thousand and sixty nine). The applicant had superannuated as a General Manager, DIC- Purulia on 31.01.2023. After completion of 08 years in service, the applicant was awarded the CAS benefits on 24.01.2015 and MCAS on 24.01.2023 on completion of 16 years in service. He was promoted to the post of General Manager/Deputy Director in terms of Court Order and continued to hold this promotional post till his superannuation on 31.01.2023.

During his service tenure, an erroneous fixation of pay was done. His pension papers were returned by the Office of the Principal Accountant General (A&E), West Bengal pointing out that there was an overdrawn by the applicant out of his erroneous fixation of pay with effect from 24.01.2007 onwards. The Office of the Principal Accountant General (A&E) advised the pension sanctioning authority to re-submit the pension proposal after rectifying of the fixation of pay and recovery of the excess payment from his retiring gratuity. In accordance with such advice, the respondent authorities calculated Rs. 6,01,069/- as the overdrawn amount and the pension proposal was re-submitted with a direction to recover the same from the applicant's retiring gratuity.

The Office of the Principal Accountant General (A&E), West Bengal has returned his pension case with the observation after pointing out the inconsistencies while fixing his pay. Accordingly, the Director, MSME, West Bengal by its order No. 65/Estt/Fix dated

ORDER SHEET

Form No.

PRABIR KUMAR ROY

Vs.

Case No. - OA-615 of 2024

THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL & ORS.

26.07.2023 refix the pay of the applicant w.e.f. 24.01.2007 onwards. It has been also advised to recover any amount which was inadvertently drawn in accordance with such observation and his pay was revised with effect from 24.01.2007 onwards and after such re-fixation, an amount of Rs. 6,01,069/-was assessed as an excess drawal of pay and allowances.

Neither the fact of the erroneous fixation of pay nor its cancellation was ever assailed and disputed by the applicant. It is only when the recovery of the overdrawn amount was detected by the office of the Principal Accountant General (A&E), West Bengal recorded in PPO, the applicant after retirement found it reasonable to challenge the same before this Tribunal and filed a representation before the respondent authorities as per leave granted by the Tribunal in OA 126 of 2023. Taking support from the judgement reported in (2015) 4 SCC 334: *State of Punjab and others-Vs.-Rafiq Masih*, the applicant argues that such recovery is a non est in the eyes of law and thus, not tenable. Paragraph 18 of the said judgement lays down that under the following situations, recoveries by the employees would be impermissible in law :

- (i) Recovery from the employees belonging to Class III and Class IV service (or Group C and Group D service).
- (ii) Recovery from the retired employees, or the employees who are due to retire within one year, of the order of recovery.
- (iii) Recovery from the employees, when the excess payment has been made for a period in excess of five years, before the order of recovery is issued.
- (iv) Recovery in cases where an employee has wrongfully been required to discharge duties of a higher post, and has been paid accordingly, even though he should have rightfully been required to work against an inferior post.

In any other case, where the court arrives at the conclusion, that recovery if made from the employee, would be iniquitous or harsh or arbitrary to such an extent, as would far outweigh the equitable balance of the employer's right to recover.

The Tribunal finds, in this case, the applicant superannuated on 31.01.2023. The erroneous fixation of upward pay started with effect from 24.01.2007 onwards and continued till the date of superannuation on 31.01.2023. The payment was made for a long duration of time for which the employee is not responsible. The impact being more unfair and improper, the decision of recovering the amount from the retiring gratuity of the applicant is iniquitous,

ORDER SHEET

Form No.

PRABIR KUMAR ROY

Vs.

Case No. - OA-615 of 2024

THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL & ORS.

harsh and arbitrary. As the error was due to mistake done by the employer, such recovery is impermissible and *non-est* in the eyes of law.

In view of the above observations, the Tribunal comes to the conclusion that the impugned memo No.169 dated 28.02.2024 is not tenable and thus quashable and it is quashed and set aside. The Tribunal directs the respondent No.2, the Director of MSME to issue necessary order for refund of the recovery amount within a period of three months time in terms of the judgement passed in *Rafiq Masih(supra)* and as per Rules and re-submit a fresh proposal to the Principal Accountant General (A&E). The office of the Principal Accountant General (A&E) is directed to act accordingly.

The application is disposed of.

(SAYEED AHMED BABA)
OFFICIATING CHAIRPERSON
and MEMBER (A)

SC