Page 1 of 2

ORDER SHEET WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

Present-

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

& The Hon'ble P. Ramesh Kumar, Member (A)

Case No OA - 153 of 2016 (TA - 8 of 2004)

Serial No. and	Tapan Kumar Neogy-Vs- The State of West Bengal & Others.Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date
Date of order.	2	and dated signature of parties when necessar
1		3
14	For the Applicant : Mr. S. Saha,	
<u> 14</u> 04.01.2019	Advocate.	
	For the Respondents : Mr. G.P. Banerjee,	
	(Proxy counsel)	
	The instant application has been filed praying for	
	recalling of the order dated 11.03.2010 passed in T.A. – 8 of	
	2004. However, the instant M.A. has been filed on 5^{th}	
	September, 2016 only for recalling of the order dated	
	11.03.2010. The applicant has filed another M.A. on 29^{th}	
	June, 2017 for condonation of delay. As per the applicant,	
	he was not aware of the transfer of the instant application.	
	Therefore, he could not be represented by the Advocate.	
	However, it is noted that application has initially filed C.R.	
	1950(W) of 1993 before the Hon'ble High Court. However,	
	vide order dated 06.11.2003 Hon'ble High Court had	
	transferred the matter to this Tribunal for want of	
	jurisdiction when the counsel for the applicant was very	
	much present. Subsequently, the said application was	
	registered as T.A. 8 of 2004 before this Tribunal. However,	
	none repeatedly appeared for the applicant and on	
	11.03.2010 this Tribunal had passed the following order :	
	"We may refer to our order dtd. 4^{th}	

ORDER SHEET

Tapan Kumar Neogy

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date
Date of order. 1	2	and dated signature of parties when necessar
	February, 2010. As petitioners are not	5
	appearing in this matter in spite of notice,	
	having regard to the relief sought for in	
	the original application. We hold that at	
	this stage, the application has become	
	infructuous. We, therefore, dispose of this	
	application."	
	From the perusal of the afore-mentioned order it is noted the	
	representative of the applicant did not appear in spite of	
	notice. Thereafter, they have filed the instant M.A. 153 of	
	2016 and on 10.01.2017 the same counsel appeared and has	
	prayed for some time. Therefore, since the counsel for the	
	applicant is present from the very date of the transferring of	
	the order and subsequently also considerable time has	
	already been lapsed and we are not satisfied with the ground	
	of delay to file the M.A. and recalling of the order.	
	Accordingly, both the M.A.s are rejected.	
	P. RAMESH KUMAR URMITA DATTA (SEN)	
	P. RAMESH KUMAR URMITA DATTA (SEN) MEMBER (A) MEMBER (J)	
A.K.P.		

Form No.