## **ORDER SHEET**

# **West Bengal Administrative Tribunal**

Present.-

The Hon'ble Justice Ranjit Kumar Bag

&

The Hon'ble Dr. Subesh Kumar Das

### Case No. OA 1326 of 2012

Bimal	Chandra Mondal Versus The State of We	st Bengal & Ors.	
Serial No. and date of order	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary.	
1	2	3	
27 28/11/2019	For the Applicant: Mr. M. Karim, Mr. A. Samad, Ld. Advocates.		
	For the State Respondent: Mrs. M. Mallick, Ld. Advocate.		
	The applicant has prayed for direction upon the		
	respondents for refund of an amount of ₹ 6,06,748/-		
	which was recovered from the retiring Gratuity and relief		
	on pension of the applicant on the ground of excess		
	payment due to wrong fixation of pay.		
	The applicant joined in the government service as		
	Employment Officer on March 02, 1987 and retired from		
	service as Joint Director of Employment on December		
	31, 2010. It appears from the letter dated September 26,		
	2012 and letter dated March 14, 2013 issued by the		
	Director of Employment, West Bengal and Joint Director		
	(Audit & Accounts) Directorate of Employment, West		
	Bengal respectively that the applicant had withdrawn a		
	sum of ₹ 6,06,748/- by receiving inadmissible		
	increments during the period from March 01, 1990 to		
	April 23, 2009 and as such the said amount of money		
	was recovered from the retiring Gratuity of the applicant		
	and from Dearness Relief on pension.		
	The question for consideration of the Tribural is		
	The question for consideration of the Tribunal is		
	whether deduction of an amount of ₹ 6,06,748/- from		

#### **ORDER SHEET** – (Continuation)

Form No.

Bimal Chandra Mondal

Vs

The State of West Bengal & Others. Case No. **OA 1326 of 2012** Order of the Tribunal Serial No. and Office action with date date of order with signature and dated signature of parties when necessary. 1 2 3 the retiring Gratuity and other retirement benefits of the applicant due to excess payment during the period of service was justified under the Law. Having heard Learned Counsel representing both parties and by following the Judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of "State of Punjab v Rafiq Masih" reported in (2015) 4SCC 334, we have to decide whether the applicant is entitled to get refund of ₹ 6,06,748/- which was deducted from his retiring Gratuity and other retirement benefits long retirement. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has summarised the following situations in paragraph 18 of the judgment of "State of Punjab v Rafiq Masih" (Supra), when recovery of excess payment by the state respondents would not be permissible 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 5 years,

#### **ORDER SHEET** – (Continuation)

Form No.

Bimal Chandra Mondal

Vs

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No. **OA 1326 of 2012** 

Case No. OA 1320 01 2012				
Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal	Office action with date		
date of order	with signature	and dated signature of		
		parties when necessary.		
1	2	3		
	before the order of recovery is issued;			

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;
- (v) 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."

We have laid down in the case of "Bireswar Dey v State of West Bengal & Ors." (OA-1045 of 2014 decided on August 20, 2018), that state respondents cannot invoke the provisions of Rule 140(2) of the West Bengal Services (Death-cum-Retirement Benefit) Rules, 1971 for recovery of excess payment of pay and allowances from the retiring Gratuity of the Government employee, particularly when the recovery of over payment from retiring gratuity is done after prolonged period from the date on which the said recovery would have been effected and thereby causing hardship to the applicant to such an extent, which will outweigh equitable balance of the right of the Government to recover the same.

By following the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme

## $\label{eq:order} \textbf{ORDER SHEET} - (\textit{Continuation})$

Form No.

Csm

Bimal Chandra Mondal

Vs

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No. <b>OA 1326 of 2012</b>				
Serial No. and date of order	Order of the	ne Tribunal gnature	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary.	
	Court in the case of "State (Supra) and the decision of Dey v State of West Bengal & view that the state responded amount of ₹ 6,06,748/- where the tring Gratuity and other applicant long after his retired.  In view of our above first Director of Employment, where the triangle of 12 (twelve) where the original application standard the original application standard the content of the order the original application standard the content of the order the original application standard the content of the order the original application standard the content of the order the original application standard the content of the order the original application standard the content of the order the original application standard the content of the order the original application standard the content of the order the original application standard the content of the order than the content of the content of the order than the content of the content of the order than the content of the co	e of Punjab v Rafiq Masih" of the Tribunal in "Bireswar & Ors." (Supra), we are of the ents are bound to refund an aich was deducted from the retirement benefits of the ement from service.  Addings, the respondent no. 2, West Bengal is directed to eye to the applicant within a weeks from the date of the weeks from the week	3	