## ORDER SHEET WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

#### Present-

The Hon'ble Justice Soumitra Pal (Chairman)

& The Hon'ble Dr.Subesh Kumar Das (Administrative Member)

Case No. OA - 497 OF 2017

MONIKA (SENGUPTA) GHOSH & ANOTHER. Vs. THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL.

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
<u> </u>	For the Applicants : Mr.A.K.Niyogi Advocate	
	For the Respondent : Mr.M.N.Roy Advocate	
	For the Advocate General : Mr.G.P.Banerjee Advocate	
	For the A.G.W.B. : Mr.B.Mitra (Departmental Representative)	
	Affidavit of service filed today be kept on record.	
	Today though the matter has come up under the heading	
	"To be Mentioned" it is submitted by Mr.A.K.Niyogi,	
	learned advocate for the applicant that the matter may	
	be heard and disposed of by granting leave to the	
	applicants to file a representation before the appropriate	
	authority ventilating their grievances and the authority	
	may be directed to dispose of the same within a	
	stipulated period.	
	In this application Monika (Sengupta) Ghosh and	
	Krishna Sengupta, the two applicants, stated to be sisters	
	of late Shankar Sengupta, U.D.C. who had expired on	
	15th May, 2006 while in service in the office of the	
	Employment - Officer In-charge SRE Employment	
	Exchange North Calcutta, Kolkata-700002, have prayed	

## **ORDER SHEET**

Form No.

### MONIKA (SENGUPTA) GHOSH & ANR.

•••• Vs.

THE STATE OF MEST DENICAL  $\theta_{-}$  ODS

Case No. <u>OA -</u>	se No. <u>OA – 497 OF 2017</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	
	for a direction upon the respondents to pay GPF as per		
	West Bengal GPF Rules, Death gratuity at the revised		
	rate as per ROPA 2009, arrears of pay for the month of		
	May 2016 claiming to be due to their deceased brother		
	and the commuted value of pension which according to		
	them are yet to be disbursed by the State authorities. On		
	a query it is submitted by Mr.Niyogi that though		
	gratuity has been released in 2011 however, other		
	benefits are yet to be released. Though representations		
	have been made those have gone unheeded. Hence		
	submission is for a direction upon the respondents to		
	make payment.		
	Mr.G.P.Banerjee, learned advocate appearing on		
	behalf of the Advocate General submits that though in		
	this application the vires of Rule 104 of DCRB Rules,		
	1971 has been challenged, however, if a direction is		
	issued upon the respondents to take a decision after		
	dealing with the specific claims, a clear picture would		
	emerge and steps can be taken accordingly.		
	Mr.M.N.Roy, learned advocate for the State and		
	Mr.B.Mitra, the Departmental representative support the		
	stand of Mr.G.P.Banerjee.		

## **ORDER SHEET**

#### MONIKA (SENGUPTA) GHOSH & ANR.

Form No.

# 

Vs. The state of west bengal & ors.

Case No. <u>OA - 497 OF 2017</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		
	Having heard Mr.Niyogi, Mr.Banerjee, Mr.Roy			
	and Mr.Mitra and considering the facts and			
	circumstances of the case, this application is disposed of			
	by granting liberty to the applicants to file a written			
	representation raising their specific grievances with			
	regard to the non-payment of the dues of late Shankar			
	Sengupta before the Director of Employment, West			
	Bengal, Kolkata, the Respondent No. 4 within four weeks			
	from the date of obtaining a copy of this order. If such			
	representation is filed, the Director of Employment shall			
	dispose of the same by passing a reasoned order to be			
	communicated to the parties within 12 weeks after			
	giving an opportunity of hearing to the two applicants			
	and after verifying the records. It is made clear that the			
	Director of Employment while coming to a decision shall			
	deal with each of the claims specifically raised. It is made			
	clear that at this stage, we have not gone into the issue			
	regarding the challenge to the vires of Rule 104 of DCRB			
	Rules, 1971 and that point is kept open.			
	(S.K.DAS) (SOUMITRA PAL) MEMBER(A) CHAIRMAN			
BLR				