

ORDER SHEET

**WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL**

Bikash Bhavan, Salt Lake, Kolkata – 700 091.

Present-

HON'BLE JUSTICE SOUMITRA PAL, HON'BLE CHAIRMAN

Serial No.  
and  
Date of  
order  
05

Case No. : OA-322/2020

11.03.2022

Chhaya Das Chaudhuri –versus- Secy., Women & Child Dev. & Social Welfare  
-And-

Case No. : OA-323/2020

Kuhu Rani Das –versus- Secy., Women & Child Dev. & Social Welfare  
-And-

Case No. : OA-324/2020

Ashima Mondal –versus- Secy., Women & Child Dev. & Social Welfare  
-And-

Case No. : OA-325/2020

Minati Sikdar –versus- Secy., Women & Child Dev. & Social Welfare  
-And-

Case No. : OA-326/2020

Shyamali Mondal –versus- Secy., Women & Child Dev. & Social Welfare  
-And-

Case No. : OA-327/2020

Jyotsna Bhattacharjee –versus- Secy., Women & Child Dev. & Social Welfare  
-And-

Case No. : OA-328/2020

Sima Chaki –versus- Secy., Women & Child Dev. & Social Welfare  
-And-

Case No. : OA-329/2020

Sikha Mukherjee –versus- Secy., Women & Child Dev. & Social Welfare  
-And-

Case No. : OA-330/2020

Aparna Dutta –versus- Secy., Women & Child Dev. & Social Welfare  
-And-

Case No. : OA-331/2020

Supra Sinha Das –versus- Secy., Women & Child Dev. & Social Welfare  
-And-

Case No. : OA-332/2020

Chhanda Jash –versus- Secy., Women & Child Dev. & Social Welfare  
-And-

Case No. : OA-333/2020

Suparna Dhar –versus- Secy., Women & Child Dev. & Social Welfare

**ORDER SHEET**

Form No. \_\_\_\_\_

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

**For the Applicants : Mr. Bharat Bhushan,  
(In all the cases) Mr. Sayan Bhattacharya,  
Advocates,**

**For the State Respondents : Mr. Soumendra Narayan Ray,  
(In all the cases) Advocate.**

The matters are taken up by the single Bench pursuant to the order contained in the Notification No. 118-WBAT/1E-08/2003 (Pt.-II) dated 11th February, 2022 issued in exercise of the powers conferred under section 6 (5) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985.

After hearing Mr. Bharat Bhusan, learned advocate for the applicants and Mr. S.N. Ray, learned advocate for the State respondents and going through the materials on record, I find since the issues in the original applications appearing as item Nos. 1 to 12 of today's cause list are identical wherein the applicants individually have prayed for implementation of the judgement after considering the ratio of law decided in OA No. 1646 of 1998 (Shila Bhattacharjee and 25 Ors – versus - The State of W.B. & Ors) to grant C.A.S. benefit, all the applications are heard analogously.

Though directions were issued on the State respondents to file reply, no reply has been filed.

The relief sought for in all the matters are similar. Accordingly, the original applications are disposed of by a common order.

The record reveals that in OA No. 946 of 1998 (Shila Bhattacharjee and 25 Ors – versus - The State of W.B. & Ors), the West Bengal Administrative Tribunal passed an order the relevant portion of the same is set out hereinbelow :-

ORDER SHEET

Form No. \_\_\_\_\_

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

*“.....We have given our anxious consideration with regard to the submissions made before us by the respective parties. But having heard the parties before us and looking into the available materials and seeing those with meticulous care, we may indicate that normally if a person is borne on a scale higher than the basic scale for the post, the same should be treated as a basic scale for his advancement under the scheme. But herein this particular case, since such upgradation of scale was in terms of the order of the Hon’ble High Court, which was ultimately accepted by the concerned department, possibly it will not be available to the concerned authorities to turn around and to say that the other benefits, such as benefit under Career Advancement Scheme should not be given to such an employee on completion of satisfactory service during this stipulated period, as mentioned in the scheme.*

*Here in this particular case also, it has been brought to our notice that ease of one Kuntal Kanti Mandal, such benefit has also been granted before actually upgradation of the pay scale of the Inspectors of Social Welfare.*

*That being the position, upon total analysis of the materials available before us and in view of our reasonings, as above, and also for the reason that when such benefit has been granted to Kuntal Kanti Mondal before upgradation of pay scale, we are inclined to accept the contentions of the petitioner in the instant case. Consequently, we hold that the circular dated 21-06-1990 of the Finance Department, Government of West Bengal will not create any impediment in the connected matter.*

*Accordingly, we quash and set aside the impugned order dated 08-12-1990 passed by the Joint Secretary, Finance Department and the order of the Deputy Secretary, Social Welfare Department issued on 03-04-1993 together*

ORDER SHEET

Form No. \_\_\_\_\_

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

*with the order dated 22-04-1998 issued by the Officer on Special Duty and Ex-officio Director of Social Welfare with a further direction upon the Respondents to consider the case of the petitioners for grant of Career Advancement Scheme benefit in terms of the extant rule within the period of 03 months from the date of communication of this order, and the Respondent Authorities are further restrained from withdrawing the benefit under Career Advancement Scheme from the petitioners, who are enjoying such benefit under the said scheme...”.*

Thereafter, the State of West Bengal, being the respondents herein, preferred a writ petition before the High Court, Calcutta, being WPST No. 147 of 2009, which was disposed of on 11<sup>th</sup> August, 2016 by affirming the order of this Tribunal, the relevant portion of which is quoted hereinbelow :-

*“.....The State authorities did not prefer any appeal against the earlier orders of the Hon’ble Court and consciously complied with the mandate of the Hon’ble Court by placing the Supervisors, similarly situated with the respondents herein, in scale no. 10 and by granting the CAS benefits through placement in scale no. 11 and that as such the contention of Mr. Mukherjee to the effect that the benefits were erroneously extended to the petitioners in the earlier writ petitions, is not acceptable. After such compliance, the denial of extension of identical benefits to the respondents is derogatory to the mandate of the Court and such action is unsustainable in law [See the judgement delivered in the case of Manohar Lal (D) by Lrs. – vs- Ugrasen (D) by Lrs. & Ors., reported in 2010 (4) Supreme 519].*

*Fairness and reasonableness are paramount issues for administrative action. As a model employer the State Government must conduct itself with high probity and candour and cannot act arbitrarily by withholding the benefits as extended to similarly situated incumbents [See the*

Form No. \_\_\_\_\_

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

*judgment delivered in the case of The Madras Port Trust versus Hymanshu International by its Proprietor V. Venkatadri (dead) by L.R.S., reported in (1979) 4 SCC 176]. Service jurisprudence evolved by this Court from time to time postulates that all persons similarly situated should be treated similarly. Only because one person has approached the court that would not mean that persons similarly situated should be treated differently [See the judgement delivered in the case of State of Karnataka & Ors. –vs- C. Lalitha, reported in (2006) 2 SCC 747].*

*The learned Tribunal, upon dealing with all the factual issues arrived at specific findings and we do not find any error, least to say any patent error of law in the judgment impugned. The scope of judicial review is very narrow and limited and such jurisdiction should be exercised sparingly and only in appropriate cases where the judicial conscience of the Court dictates. The impugned judgment does not suffer from any jurisdictional error or any substantial failure of justice or any manifest injustice warranting interference of this Court.*

*For the reasons discussed above, we do not find any reason to interfere with the judgment impugned. The writ petition and the connected application are, accordingly, dismissed...”.*

Aggrieved by the aforesaid judgement, the State of West Bengal has preferred a Special Leave Petition before the Supreme Court of India being Special Leave Petition (Civil) Diary No. (s). 40494 / 2017 which was dismissed on 05<sup>th</sup> February, 2018.

Subsequently, the State respondents have complied with the direction passed in OA No. 1646 of 1998 (supra) and submitted a compliance report before this Tribunal on 8<sup>th</sup> February, 2019 in C.C.P. No. 41 of 2008. Thereafter, the applicants individually submitted representation to the

**ORDER SHEET**

Form No. \_\_\_\_\_

Case No. \_\_\_\_\_

respondent No. 3 herein (Annexure A / 8) to the original application praying for reliefs in terms of O. A. No. 1646 of 1998 and WPST No. 147 of 2009. The aforesaid representations are still pending for disposal as the respondents, especially the respondent No. 3, is yet to take a decision in the light of the ratio of law decided by the Tribunal in O. A. No. 1646 of 1998, which has been affirmed by the High Court, Calcutta in WPST No. 147 of 2009, which was further affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court on 5<sup>th</sup> February, 2018.

After considering the aforesaid factual aspect of the case and submission of the learned counsel of the contesting parties, all the applications are disposed of by directing the Director of ICDS, Government of West Bengal, Kolkata, the respondent No. 3, to consider and dispose of the representations of the applicants, being annexure (Annexure A / 8) in all the applications, strictly adhering to settled principles of law laid down in O. A. No. 1646 of 1998 and in WPST No. 147 of 2009 within a period of fifteen weeks from the date of presentation of a copy of this order downloaded from the website of the Tribunal.

No order as to cost.

**(SOUMITRA PAL)**  
**CHAIRMAN**

Skg