Page **1** of **9**

ORDER SHEET WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

Present-

The Hon'ble Mrs. Urmita Datta (Sen), Member(J) The Hon'ble Mr. P. Ramesh Kumar, Member(A)

Case No - OA- 1091 of 2015.

	Dipak Kumar Kamila. <u>Vs</u> The State of West Bengal & Other	
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
16	For the Applicant : Mrs. S. Agarwal, Ld. Advocate.	3
24/12/2019		
	For the State Respondents: Mr. A. De, Ms. R. Sarkar, Departmental Representatives Land & Land Reforms Deptt.	
	The instant application has been filed	
	praying for following relief :-	
	"a) An order directing the concerned Respondents	
	herein to consider the grievance of the applicant	
	forthwith.	
	b) An order directing the concerned Respondents	
	herein to set aside and/or quash the impugned	
	order dated 17.07.2015 passed by the respondent	
	No.2 and the order dated 07.05.2015 passed by the	
	respondent No.3 forthwith and treat the entire	
	suspension period as the applicant was on duty.	
	c) An order of stay of the impugned order dated	
	17.07.2015 passed by the respondent No.2 and the	
	order dated 07.05.2015 of the respondent No.3	
	forthwith till the disposal of the application.	
	d) An order directing the Respondents authorities	
	to certify and transmit all the records of the case so	

Dipak Kumar Kamila.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No <u>OA- 1091 of 2015</u>.

Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date
Date of order.	2	and dated signature of parties when necessary
1	that conscionable justice may be administered by	3
	that conscionable justice may be administered by	
	perusing the same by this Hon'ble Tribunal.	
	e) Rule NISI in terms of the prayers above.	
	f) To make the Rule absolute if no cause is shown	
	and/or insufficient cause is shown by the	
	concerned respondents.	
	g) To pass any other or further or orders as to this	
	Hon'ble Tribunal may deem fit and proper."	
	As per the applicant, while posted in the	
	office of the Block Land and Land Reforms Officer,	
	Kharagpur I, he was served with an order dated	
	30.05.2015 (Annexure A), whereby the BL & LRO,	
	Kharagpur-I in pursuance to the order of the ADM	
	& D.L. & L.R.O. Paschim Medinipur vide his Memo	
	dated 27.04.12 Sri Narayan Das, R.O. had ordered	
	to attend the programme of demarcation in respect	
	of Defence Land at Air Force Station, Kalaikunda	
	along with the other official personnel including the	
	applicant as Amin. Thereafter, necessary	
	programme of demarcation was conducted and	
	necessary sketch map was prepared by the Amin	
	placing therein and the said sketch map was	
	signed by R.O. & Concerned B.L. & L.R.O.	
	Subsequently, the same was handed over to the	
	Block Land and Land Reforms Officer, Kharagpur I.	

Form No.

Dipak Kumar Kamila.

Form No.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No OA- 1091	1 of 2015.	
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
	However, all on a sudden, the applicant	
	received one Memo dated 08.10.2013 issued by the	
	A.D.M. and District Land and Land Reforms	
	Officer, Paschim Medinipur with a charge that the	
	applicant being Amin attached to the Office of the	
	B.L. & L.R.O. Kharagpur I, two maps, one in 2009	
	and another in 2013 both on $8" = 1$ mile scale of	
	calculation of the Air Force Station, Salua and	
	deliberately caused a grave error in demarcating	
	the boundary of the aforesaid Air Force Station on	
	both the occasions (Annexure B). Simultaneously,	
	he was also being put under suspension. In the	
	meantime the applicant filed an application dated	
	07.11.2014 to the respondent No.3 for disposing of	
	the disciplinary proceeding as soon as possible	
	since the applicant was suffering with suspension.	
	Thereafter, he was served with a Memo dated	
	22.12.2014 with a charge of negligence in	
	preparation of map and without the permission	
	and approval of the higher authority (Annexure –C)	
	(handing over the papers to Air Force authorities).	
	The applicant filed his written statements of	
	defence. Subsequently, enquiry was conducted	
	and he was served with a Memo dated 21.04.2015	
	(Annexure E) proposing an award of penalty of	
	withholding of three annual increments in the scale	
	1	1

Dipak Kumar Kamila.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Order of the Tribunal with signature Office action with date Serial No. and and dated signature Date of order. 2 of parties when necessary 1 3 Against the said show-cause notice, the of pay. applicant filed representation on 04.05.2015 denying all the charges and proposed penalty. However, the applicant was served with а punishment order of stoppage of three annual increments with cumulative effect vide Disciplinary Authority's Order dated 07.05.2015 (Annexure G). Being aggrieved with, the applicant preferred an appeal before the Appellate Authority i.e. Director of Land Records and Surveys & Jt. LRC, West Bengal on 24.06.2015 (Annexure H). The said Appellate Authority dated 17.07.2015 modified the order of punishment imposing of penalty of holding of two increments with cumulative effect. Being aggrieved with, the applicant has filed this As per the applicant, aforesaid application. demarcation programme was also attended by the BL & LRO and R.O. along with others. However, they were neither charge sheeted nor imposed with any punishment which would be reflected in the order dated 17.07.2015. Further, there is no charge of intentional mistake or any ulterior motive or of any financial implication. Therefore. according to the applicant even if there is any mistake or error in doing his official duties, it

Form No.

Case No OA- 1091 of 2015.

Dipak Kumar Kamila.

••••

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

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
	cannot be termed as misconduct as the other	
	higher authorities who had approved the said map,	
	have been spared from the disciplinary proceeding.	
	Therefore, he has prayed for quashing of the order	
	dated 07.05.2015 & 17.07.2015.	
	The respondents have filed their reply	
	wherein they have stated that the Amin is the	
	trained person about the measurement of field and	
	preparation of coloured map for demarcation	
	programme. However, he had made some mistake	
	while preparing the map and such map created	
	problems for administration and gave a scope to	
	some unauthorised occupant to take advantage of	
	the situation. However, the applicant was granted	
	opportunity to defend his case. Therefore, there is	
	no violation of principles of natural justice and the	
	authorities have rightly imposed the punishment	
	upon the applicant.	
	The applicant has filed rejoinder and has	
	vehemently submitted that though he was	
	entrusted to prepare the map, one more Amin was	
	also deputed along with applicant and while work	
	was completed under the supervision of the BL &	
	LRO. Therefore, it cannot be claimed that the	

Form No.

Case No OA- 1091 of 2015.

Dipak Kumar Kamila.

.... Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No <u>OA-1091 of 2015.</u>		sengar & Others.	
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	
	applicant is alone responsible for such wrong		
	mapping.		
	We have heard both the parties and perused		
	the records. It is noted that the applicant was		
	charge sheeted on the allegation that due to his		
	wrong mapping, administration had faced problems		
	over the actual quantum of the land held by the Air		
	Force. Furthermore, it has also been alleged that		
	without any permission and approval of the higher		
	authority, he had also handed over copies to both		
	the office of the Air Force for which the applicant		
	had to face the disciplinary proceeding and was		
	ultimately imposed with a punishment of		
	withholding of three increments with cumulative		
	effect. He preferred an appeal before the appellate		
	authority and the Appellate Authority vide his		
	order dated 17.7.15 as observed inter alia;		
	"The DLLRO & his representative stated that		
	the incumbent had full knowledge of the area and		
	he did this map with malafied intention. But the		
	DLLRO could not give any document in support of		
	this allegation.		
	Further, the DLLRO stated that due to this		
	wrong preparation of map there was a huge law &		
	order problem.		

Form No.

Dipak Kumar Kamila.

Form No.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No OA- 1091	se No <u>OA-1091 of 2015.</u>	
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
	Another charge is this that the Amin handed	
	over this map to the Air Force Authority without	
	obtaining any approval from the higher authority.	
	But it is not clear why the BLLRO handed over the	
	map to the Amin after putting his signature on the	
	map. It should be the duty of the BLLRO to keep	
	custody of the map after putting his signature for	
	further action.	
	Perused the report of the I.A. and order the	
	D.A. It is a fact that the incumbent made an error	
	in preparation of map. But there is no proof which	
	shows that he did it with malafide intention.	
	Moreover, the map was signed by the R.O.	
	and BLLRO and it is the responsibility of the R.O.	
	& BLLRO, being the higher authorities of Amin, to	
	check and rectify the error if any. But R.O. and	
	BLLRO could not do so. In fact, both R.O. &	
	BLLRO failed to guide the Amin properly.	
	It is a fact that the incumbent made an error	
	in preparation of map & thereby failed to perform	
	his duty properly. He should mark the unserveyed	
	area with some noting/signage 7 should write 'not	
	to scale' on the map which he did not. So, the	
	incumbent cannot avoid his responsibility. But	
	punishment inflicted by the DLLRO, Paschim	
	Medinipur vide his Order No.147/Con-26/13 dated	

Dipak Kumar Kamila.

Form No.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No <u>OA-1091</u>	of 2015.	C
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
	07.05.2015 appears to be slightly harsh.	
	Hence, the punishment given by the D.A. is	
	modified in the effect that 02(two) annual	
	increments be withheld without cumulative effect	
	in terms of rule 8(ii) of the West Bengal Services	
	(Classification, Control & Appeal) Rules, 1971.	
	All concerned may be informed accordingly."	
	From the perusal of the order of the	
	Appellate Authority, it is noted that the Appellate	
	Authority is also of the opinion that R.O. and BL &	
	LRO were very much aware and responsible about	
	the wrong mapping and further it has been also	
	observed that there is an error in preparation of	
	map. However, there was no such malafide	
	intention as the map was signed by R.O. and BL &	
	LRO who are responsible being higher authority to	
	check and rectify the error, if any, but R.O. & B.L.	
	& L.R.O. did not do so. However, the appellate	
	authority has modified the punishment of stoppage	
	of increments for holding of two annual increments	
	with cumulative effect.	
	From the above, it is observed that	
	admittedly there is no allegation of intentional	
	mistake/error or any ulterior motive and/or	
	financial implication on the part of applicant.	
	Further, the applicant has been treated	

Dipak Kumar Kamila.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Office action with date Serial No. and Order of the Tribunal with signature and dated signature Date of order. 2 of parties when necessary 1 3 discriminately along with the other higher authorities. Therefore, in our considered view the penalty imposed on the applicant is harsh and disproportionate. Accordingly, we quash and set aside the appellate order dated 17.07.2015 and remand back the matter to the Appellate Authority for reconsideration of the case of the applicant afresh and communicate the same by a reasoned and speaking order within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of the order. Accordingly, the OA is **disposed of** with the above observation and direction with no order as to cost. P. RAMESH KUMAR **URMITA DATTA(SEN)** GM **MEMBER(J)** MEMBER(A)

Form No.

Case No OA- 1091 of 2015.