ORDER SHEET WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

CASE No. OA 412 of 2018.

Present-

Hon'ble Justice Soumitra Pal, Hon'ble Chairman.

& Hon'ble Dr. Subesh Kumar Das, Administrative Member.

	ALOKE CHANDRA SAHANA -Vs- THE STATE OF W.B. & ORS.	
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
7 12.3.2019.	For the Applicant : Mr. S.K. Nandi, Advocate.	
	For the State Respondent Mr. S. Ghosh, Nos. 1 & 2 : Advocate.	
	For the Principal Accountant General (A & E) W.B. : Mr. B. Mitra, Departmental representative.	
	In this application the applicant, who was	
	appointed as Peon temporarily in the office of the Junior	
	Land Reforms Officer and subsequently confirmed and	
	promoted to the post of Lower Division Clerk on 1 st July,	
	1998 and again promoted as Upper Division Clerk and	
	thereafter subjected to disciplinary proceedings, has	
	prayed for certain reliefs, the relevant portion of which is	
	as under :-	
	"a) An order and/or direction be passed to	
	cancel, withdraw, rescind and/or set aside the order	
	dated 11.10.2010 passed by the District Magistrate and	
	Collector, Hooghly, contained in the appeal being	
	Annexure "A".	
	b) An order and/or direction be passed to cancel,	
	withdraw, rescind the Memo No. 933/E dated	

ALOKE CHANDRA SAHANA.

Form No.

....

Vs.

Case No. OA 412 of 2018.

Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date and dated signature
Date of order. 1	2	of parties when necessary 3
	13.06.20017 and further restrain the Respondents and	
	each of them from making any further recovery :	
	c) An order and/or direction be issued to	
	forthwith release the retriral benefits and also the	
	pension in accordance with law:	
	d) An order and/or direction be issued to	
	forthwith dispose of the appeal filed by the applicant on	
	22.12.2010 as contained in Annexure "A"".	
	As noted disciplinary proceedings were	
	initiated against the applicant by issuing show cause	
	notice which was replied to on 30 th April, 2007. The	
	Disciplinary Authority on 26 th July, 2007 passed an order,	
	the relevant portion of which is as under :-	
	"that Sri Aloke Chandra Sahana now	
	working at Excise Department, in District Magistrate &	
	Collector Office, Hooghly is treated as retired on	
	superannuation on 31.12.2003 in the afternoon and	
	further ordered that his pension is permanently stopped	
	under rule 10 of West Bengal Services (Death-Cum-	
	Retirement) Rules, 1971 and that his retiral dues are	
	forfeited to the State towards recouping and recovery of	
	the monetary loss incurred in the meantime by the State.	

ALOKE CHANDRA SAHANA.

Form No.

Vs.

....

Case No. OA 412 of 2018.

Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date and dated signature
Date of order.	2	of parties when necessary
1		3
	Inform Sri Sahana and all concerned".	
	Aggrieved the applicant filed an application	
	being OA 7599 of 2007, which was disposed of by the	
	Tribunal by passing an order dated 17 th June, 2010, the	
	relevant portion of which is as under :-	
	"Mr. Ghosh frankly submits that order of the	
	District Magistrate & Collector, Hooghly, dated 26 th July,	
	2007 on the face of record , does not appear to be legally	
	correct. But he prays for liberty to modify such order in	
	accordance with Rule.	
	On hearing the Ld. Advocates of both the sides,	
	we find that the petitioner entered into service in the	
	State government in the year 1966 and after almost 3	
	decades, a proceeding was initiated against him on the	
	allegation that by procuring a false certificate regarding	
	his date of birth and by procuring a false certificate	
	regarding his educational qualification, he entered into	
	service and, subsequently, obtained promotion. After a	
	thorough enquiry in which the petitioner participated, the	
	enquiring authority found the petitioner guilty of charges	
	and the Disciplinary Authority District Magistrate &	
	Collector, Hooghly, thereafter, passed the impugned	

ALOKE CHANDRA SAHANA.

Form No.

Vs.

....

Case No. OA 412 of 2018.

Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date and dated signature
Date of order.	2	of parties when necessary
1		3
	order.	
	We find that the impugned order is not	
	sustainable in law as the power vested by Rule 10 of the	
	DCRB Rule 1971, can be exercised only by the Governor	
	and not by any other authority and from that view point,	
	the order of the Disciplinary Authority is vitiated.	
	Now, after considering the entire background	
	of the present case, we like to dispose of this application	
	by directing the Disciplinary Authority :-	
	(1)First to consider sympathetically whether	
	once the petitioner was directed to go on superannuation	
	as per the date of birth accepted by the Disciplinary	
	Authority, he can be penalized by stoppage of full pension	
	and whether he can be granted the benefit of pension and	
	other retiral benefits, treating his superannuation on 31 st	
	December, 2003 which has been accepted by the	
	authority,	
	(2)If the Disciplinary Authority does not	
	accept the above position , our next suggestion would be	
	to pass appropriate order under Rule 8 of the DCRB Rules,	
	1971 after complying all the provisions and in that case, if	
	any adverse order is passed, touching the pension of the	

ALOKE CHANDRA SAHANA.

Form No.

....

Vs.

Case No. OA 412 of 2018.

Serial No. and Date of order.	Order of the Tribunal with signature 2	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary
1	notitioner the notitioner shall have the newer to anneal	3
	petitioner, the petitioner shall have the power to appeal	
	as provided in the said Rule of DCRB Rule, 1971.	
	Finally, we direct the Disciplinary Authority to	
	dispose of the matter in either of the way within a period	
	of 3 months by giving personal hearing to the petitioner	
	and also to communicate his decision to the petitioner	
	within 4 weeks after disposal of matter as per our	
	order".	
	Pursuant to the said order, the disciplinary	
	authority had passed an order on 11 th October, 2010 the	
	relevant portion of which is as under :-	
	"On this point Ld. West Bengal	
	Administrative Tribunal had observed that the power	
	vested by Rule 10 of the DCRB Rule 1971, can be exercised	
	only by the Governor and not by any other authority.	
	In light of the above, I , <u>Order</u> that Sri Aloke	
	Chandra Sahana who worked at the Excise Department	
	under the District Magistrate and Collector office,	
	Hooghly be treated as retired on superannuation on	
	31.12.2003 in the afternoon as Group 'D' Employee and	
	his promotion to the post of L.D.C. in 1982 and thereafter	
	from L.D.C. to U.D.C. in 1998 is hereby cancelled ab-initia	

ALOKE CHANDRA SAHANA.

Form No.

....

Vs.

Case No. OA 412 of 2018.

Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date and dated signature
Date of order.	2	of parties when necessary
1		3
	and his service period from 01.04.2004 to 30.07.2007 be	
	treated as overstayal.	
	He will be entitled for receiving pension as per	
	rule from 1.1.2004 and retiral benefit as entitled for	
	Group 'D' employee. Excess payment causing the	
	promotional benefit and duty period from 1.1.2004 to	
	30.7.2007 for rendering his office duty will be recovered	
	from his retiral benefit.	
	Inform Sri Sahana and all concerned".	
	Being aggrieved by the said order dated 11 th	
	October, 2010, the applicant filed an appeal which was	
	subsequently withdrawn as evident from the letter dated	
	1 st June, 2011 appearing at page 65 of the application.	
	Thereafter the Superintendent of Excise, Hooghly and	
	Joint Commissioner of Excise had issued a memo dated	
	13 th June, 2017, the relevant portion of which is as	
	under:-	
	"With reference to above, this is to inform	
	that the recovery of Rs. 54824/- from GPF is lying pending	
	as the final payment of GPF is yet to be settled. Recovery	
	from retiring gratuity of Rs. 99776/- and leave salary of	
	Rs. 61470/- (revised) have been made as per your memo	

ALOKE CHANDRA SAHANA.

Form No.

Vs.

....

Case No. OA 412 of 2018.

Date of order. 2 and dated signature of parties when necessary 1 no. PenV/2241211712/4/1015073933/P/15/10/85035A dated 28.08.15 (copy enclosed) and memo no. Pen V /16/1015073933/107824 dtd 16.03.2016 (copy enclosed). Now, you are requested to issue of fresh order regarding recovery of the remaining amount of the overdrawals towards pay & allowances (Rs. 4,60,792/-) and GPF (Rs. 3,02,933/-) from pension so that we may issue the clearance certificate to the pensioner". Mr. S.K. Nandi, learned advocate for the applicant submits that as no order has been passed by the appellate authority regarding withdrawal of appeal, entire proceeding leading to the issue of memo of 13 th June, 2017 cannot be sustained and be set aside. According to him, his promotion and the benefit arising out of it have been illegally curtailed. Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order			
1 of parties when necessary 1 no. PenV/2241211712/4/1015073933/P/15/10/85035A dated 28.08.15 (copy enclosed) and memo no. Pen V /16/1015073933/107824 dtd 16.03.2016 (copy enclosed). Now, you are requested to issue of fresh order regarding recovery of the remaining amount of the overdrawals towards pay & allowances (Rs. 4,60,792/-) and GPF (Rs. 3,02,933/-) from pension so that we may issue the clearance certificate to the pensioner". Mr. S.K. Nandi, learned advocate for the applicant submits that as no order has been passed by the appellate authority regarding withdrawal of appeal, entire proceeding leading to the issue of memo of 13 th June, 2017 cannot be sustained and be set aside. According to him, his promotion and the benefit arising out of it have been illegally curtailed. Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order	Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date and dated signature
no. PenV/2241211712/4/1015073933/P/15/10/85035A dated 28.08.15 (copy enclosed) and memo no. Pen V /16/1015073933/107824 dtd 16.03.2016 (copy enclosed). Now, you are requested to issue of fresh order regarding recovery of the remaining amount of the overdrawals towards pay & allowances (Rs. 4,60,792/-) and GPF (Rs. 3,02,933/-) from pension so that we may issue the clearance certificate to the pensioner". Mr. S.K. Nandi, learned advocate for the applicant submits that as no order has been passed by the appellate authority regarding withdrawal of appeal, entire proceeding leading to the issue of memo of 13 th June, 2017 cannot be sustained and be set aside. According to him, his promotion and the benefit arising out of it have been illegally curtailed. Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		2	-
dated 28.08.15 (copy enclosed) and memo no. Pen V /16/1015073933/107824 dtd 16.03.2016 (copy enclosed). Now, you are requested to issue of fresh order regarding recovery of the remaining amount of the overdrawals towards pay & allowances (Rs. 4,60,792/-) and GPF (Rs. 3,02,933/-) from pension so that we may issue the clearance certificate to the pensioner". Mr. S.K. Nandi, learned advocate for the applicant submits that as no order has been passed by the appellate authority regarding withdrawal of appeal, entire proceeding leading to the issue of memo of 13 th June, 2017 cannot be sustained and be set aside. According to him, his promotion and the benefit arising out of it have been illegally curtailed. Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order	I		3
 /16/1015073933/107824 dtd 16.03.2016 (copy enclosed). Now, you are requested to issue of fresh order regarding recovery of the remaining amount of the overdrawals towards pay & allowances (Rs. 4,60,792/-) and GPF (Rs. 3,02,933/-) from pension so that we may issue the clearance certificate to the pensioner". Mr. S.K. Nandi, learned advocate for the applicant submits that as no order has been passed by the appellate authority regarding withdrawal of appeal, entire proceeding leading to the issue of memo of 13th June, 2017 cannot be sustained and be set aside. According to him, his promotion and the benefit arising out of it have been illegally curtailed. Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order 		no. PenV/2241211712/4/1015073933/P/15/10/85035A	
Now, you are requested to issue of fresh order regarding recovery of the remaining amount of the overdrawals towards pay & allowances (Rs. 4,60,792/-) and GPF (Rs. 3,02,933/-) from pension so that we may issue the clearance certificate to the pensioner". Mr. S.K. Nandi, learned advocate for the applicant submits that as no order has been passed by the appellate authority regarding withdrawal of appeal, entire proceeding leading to the issue of memo of 13 th June, 2017 cannot be sustained and be set aside. According to him, his promotion and the benefit arising out of it have been illegally curtailed. Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		dated 28.08.15 (copy enclosed) and memo no. Pen V	
regarding recovery of the remaining amount of the overdrawals towards pay & allowances (Rs. 4,60,792/-) and GPF (Rs. 3,02,933/-) from pension so that we may issue the clearance certificate to the pensioner". Mr. S.K. Nandi, learned advocate for the applicant submits that as no order has been passed by the appellate authority regarding withdrawal of appeal, entire proceeding leading to the issue of memo of 13 th June, 2017 cannot be sustained and be set aside. According to him, his promotion and the benefit arising out of it have been illegally curtailed. Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		/16/1015073933/107824 dtd 16.03.2016 (copy enclosed).	
overdrawals towards pay & allowances (Rs. 4,60,792/-) and GPF (Rs. 3,02,933/-) from pension so that we may issue the clearance certificate to the pensioner". Mr. S.K. Nandi, learned advocate for the applicant submits that as no order has been passed by the appellate authority regarding withdrawal of appeal, entire proceeding leading to the issue of memo of 13 th June, 2017 cannot be sustained and be set aside. According to him, his promotion and the benefit arising out of it have been illegally curtailed. Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		Now, you are requested to issue of fresh order	
and GPF (Rs. 3,02,933/-) from pension so that we may issue the clearance certificate to the pensioner". Mr. S.K. Nandi, learned advocate for the applicant submits that as no order has been passed by the appellate authority regarding withdrawal of appeal, entire proceeding leading to the issue of memo of 13 th June, 2017 cannot be sustained and be set aside. According to him, his promotion and the benefit arising out of it have been illegally curtailed. Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		regarding recovery of the remaining amount of the	
issue the clearance certificate to the pensioner". Mr. S.K. Nandi, learned advocate for the applicant submits that as no order has been passed by the appellate authority regarding withdrawal of appeal, entire proceeding leading to the issue of memo of 13 th June, 2017 cannot be sustained and be set aside. According to him, his promotion and the benefit arising out of it have been illegally curtailed. Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		overdrawals towards pay & allowances (Rs. 4,60,792/-)	
Mr. S.K. Nandi, learned advocate for the applicant submits that as no order has been passed by the appellate authority regarding withdrawal of appeal, entire proceeding leading to the issue of memo of 13 th June, 2017 cannot be sustained and be set aside. According to him, his promotion and the benefit arising out of it have been illegally curtailed. Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		and GPF (Rs. 3,02,933/-) from pension so that we may	
applicant submits that as no order has been passed by the appellate authority regarding withdrawal of appeal, entire proceeding leading to the issue of memo of 13 th June, 2017 cannot be sustained and be set aside. According to him, his promotion and the benefit arising out of it have been illegally curtailed. Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		issue the clearance certificate to the pensioner".	
the appellate authority regarding withdrawal of appeal, entire proceeding leading to the issue of memo of 13 th June, 2017 cannot be sustained and be set aside. According to him, his promotion and the benefit arising out of it have been illegally curtailed. Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		Mr. S.K. Nandi, learned advocate for the	
entire proceeding leading to the issue of memo of 13 th June, 2017 cannot be sustained and be set aside. According to him, his promotion and the benefit arising out of it have been illegally curtailed. Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		applicant submits that as no order has been passed by	
June, 2017 cannot be sustained and be set aside. According to him, his promotion and the benefit arising out of it have been illegally curtailed. Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		the appellate authority regarding withdrawal of appeal,	
According to him, his promotion and the benefit arising out of it have been illegally curtailed. Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		entire proceeding leading to the issue of memo of 13 th	
out of it have been illegally curtailed. Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		June, 2017 cannot be sustained and be set aside.	
Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		According to him, his promotion and the benefit arising	
behalf of the State respondents submits that the challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		out of it have been illegally curtailed.	
challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		Mr. S. Ghosh, learned advocate appearing on	
the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		behalf of the State respondents submits that the	
by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		challenge to the order passed on 11 th October, 2010 by	
Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order		the disciplinary authority is not maintainable as it is hit	
		by the limitation prescribed in Section 21(1)(a) of the	
contained in the memo dated 12 th lung 2017 is in		Administrative Tribunals Act, 1985 and the order	
		contained in the memo dated 13 th June, 2017 is in	

ALOKE CHANDRA SAHANA.

Form No.

....

Vs.

Case No. OA 412 of 2018.

			1
Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal with si	gnature	Office action with date and dated signature
Date of order.	2		of parties when necessary
1		th 0 + 1 - 2010	3
	consequence of the order dated 11	October, 2010.	
	Submission is had appeal been pending	, pension in favour	
	of the applicant would not have	e been released.	
	Submission is the applicant is now drav	ving pension. Since	
	the applicant has accepted pension,	the application is	
	without merit.		
	Heard Mr. Nandi, Mr Gl	hosh and Mr. B.	
	Mitra, the departmental representative	2.	
	In our view the order da	ated 11 th October,	
	2010 cannot be challenged by filing	this application in	
	2018 as it is hit by the limitation prescr	ibed under section	
	21(1)(a) of the 1985 Act. So far as the	e memo dated 13 th	
	June, 2017 is concerned, it is in co	nsequence to the	
	order dated 11 th October, 2010. More	over, the applicant	
	is now drawing pension and thus in e	ffect has accepted	
	the order dated 11 th October, 201	0 and the order	
	contained in the memo dated 13 th June	e, 2017. Hence, no	
	order is passed on this application.	The application is	
	dismissed.		
Skg.	(Subesh Kumar Das)	(Soumitra Pal)	
JNB.	Member(A).	Chairman.	

ALOKE CHANDRA SAHANA.

Form No.

....

Vs.

Case No. OA 412 of 2018.

•••••	•••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•••••

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		3