## 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 West Bengal \& Ors.

| Serial No. and <br> date of order | Order of the Tribunal <br> with signature | Office action with date <br> and dated signature of <br> parties when necessary. <br> 3 |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\frac{27}{28 / 11 / 2019}$ | For the Applicant | Mr. M. Karim, <br> Mr. A. Samad, <br> Ld. Advocates. |  |
| For the State Respondent : Mrs. M. Mallick, | Md. Advocate. |  |  | 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and Joint Director (Audit \& Accounts) Directorate of Employment, West Bengal respectively that the applicant had withdrawn a sum of $₹ 6,06,748 /-$ by receiving inadmissible increments during the period from March 01, 1990 to April 23, 2009 and as such the said amount of money was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 Tribunal is whether deduction of an amount of ₹ 6,06,748/- from
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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 after 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,
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Court in the case of "State of Punjab v Rafiq Masih" (Supra) and the decision of the Tribunal in "Bireswar Dey v State of West Bengal \& Ors." (Supra), we are of the view that the state respondents are bound to refund an amount of ₹ 6,06,748/- which was deducted from the retiring Gratuity and other retirement benefits of the applicant long after his retirement from service.

In view of our above findings, the respondent no. 2, Director of Employment, West Bengal is directed to refund a sum of ₹ $6,06,748 /$ - to the applicant within a period of 12 (twelve) weeks from the date of communication of the order. With the above direction, the original application stands disposed of.

Let a Plain Copy of the order be supplied to both parties.
S. K. DAS
MEMBER(A)
R. K. BAG
MEMBER(J)

