

**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 658 of 2021**

**Dipankar Hore - Vs - The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Serial No. and  
Date of order

12  
28.02.2024

For the Applicant : Mr. S. Bhattacharjee,  
Learned Advocate.

For the State Respondents : Mr. G. Halder,  
Learned Advocate.

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.

On consent of the learned counsels for the contesting parties, the case is taken up for consideration sitting singly.

Supplementary application filed by Mr. Bhattacharjee. Copy has been served. Be kept with the record.

In this application, the prayer is for directing the respondents to set aside the impugned order dated 18.02.2021 issued by the respondents. In the impugned order, the application for compassionate appointment was considered and rejected on the following grounds which is quoted as under :-

**“...his application for compassionate appointment has been rejected as his family income exceeds 90 % of the gross monthly salary of the employee before death and it also exceeds minimum salary of Group-C employee as per rules and conditions as laid down in rule 6(a) (i) & (ii) of the Notification No. 251-Emp dated 03.12.2013 of Labour Department, Govt. of West Bengal.”**

Mr. Halder, appearing on behalf of the respondents submits that in support of the reason a detailed financial calculation has been shown to prove that the total family

**ORDER SHEET**

Form No.

**Dipankar Hore**

Vs.

Case No **OA 658 of 2021**

**THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL & OTHERS.**

---

income of the applicant exceeds more than 90% of the last gross salary of the deceased employee before his death. Therefore, the applicant is not entitled for compassionate employment and was thus rejected.

It appears that in the rejoinder, the applicant has not challenged the calculations as shown in the reply by the applicant. Therefore, the reason of rejection total family income being more than 90% as shown in the calculation sheet has not been controverted by the applicant.

In the reply, the calculation sheet has been enclosed showing details of the income being earned by the family. As per this sheet the total monthly earning of the family which includes family pension and interest @ 8% comes to Rs. 21,336/- which is more than 90% of the last gross monthly salary earned by the deceased employee, which was Rs. 18,826/-.

Submission of Mr. Bhattacharjee is that Sl. No. 3 of Notification No. 419/Law, it has been made clear that in stead of 8% interest per annum, the “prevailing rate would be the revised rate of interest as provided by the bank where the gratuity, leave encashment will be deposited.”

Basing his calculation on the revised provision as laid down in the above Notification, Mr. Bhattacharjee refers to page 8 of this supplementary application which appears to be a statement from the bank to the effect that the effective rate of interest will be 3.5% only, therefore, the rate of interest fixed at 8% by the respondent is arbitrary and, therefore, the amount shown as Rs. 4331/- shown as income from 8% rate of interest is not only incorrect but is a exaggeration. Mr. Bhattacharjee further submits that based at 3.5% rate of interest, the total

**ORDER SHEET**

Form No.

**Dipankar Hore**

Vs.

Case No **OA 658 of 2021**

**THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL & OTHERS.**

---

earnings from such source should be only around Rs. 2073/-.

Let Mr. Bhattacharjee file a calculation sheet disputing the figures shown in the Calculation Sheet filed earlier by the respondents.

Let the matter appear under the heading Hearing on **24.07.2024**.

**(SAYEED AHMED BABA)**  
**OFFICIATING CHAIRPERSON AND MEMBER (A)**

sc