ORDER SHEET West Bengal Administrative Tribunal

Present.-

The Hon'ble Justice Ranjit Kumar Bag

R

The Hon'ble Dr. Subesh Kumar Das

Case No. **OA-531 of 2013**

date of order	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary
1	2	3
11 20/11/2019	For the Applicant: Mrs. S. Mitra, Ld. Advocate.	
	For the State Respondent: Mr. B.P. Roy, Ld. Advocate.	
	For the P.S.C., W.B. : Mr. A.L. Basu, Mr. S. Bhattacharya, Ld. Advocates.	
	The applicant has prayed for direction upon the	
	respondents for grant of promotion to the applicant with	
	retrospective effect from the date when his colleagues	
	were granted promotion and all ancillary reliefs.	
	The applicant joined in the office of Sub-Registrar	
	in the Directorate of Registration and Stamp Revenue,	
	Government of West Bengal on June 07, 1983. He was	
	confirmed in the service on December 14, 2000. The	
	contention of the applicant is that he was denied	
	promotion to the post of Additional District Sub-	
	Registrar initially on the plea of pendency of the enquiry	
	by the Vigilance Commission and subsequently on the	
	plea of poor rating in the A.C.R. The applicant retired	
	from service on April 30, 2013 without receiving any	
	benefit of promotion in his entire career.	
	During pendency of the original application, the	
	applicant filed Miscellaneous Application No. 110/2014	
	praying for grant of provisional pension and other	

ORDER SHEET – (Continuation)

Form No.

Vs

Office action with date

and dated signature of

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No. **OA-531 of 2013**

Serial No. and

date of order

1

1	2	parties when necessary.
	retirement benefits after taking into consideration his	
	qualifying service for more than 33 years. On December	
	09, 2014 this Tribunal passed an interim order in MA-	
	110/2014, whereby the respondents were directed to	
	release pension in favour of the applicant on the basis of	
	last pay drawn by him and disburse other retirement	
	benefits including the amount of General Provident	
	Fund within specific period of 04 (four) months from the	
	date of communication of the order. Mrs. Mitra, Learned	

Counsel for the applicant contends that the applicant

has already received pension and other retirement

benefits and as such the applicant is now pressing for

grant of promotion which was denied to him in an

unjustified manner during his entire service career.

Order of the Tribunal

with signature

The state respondents have specifically stated in the reply that the promotion was denied to the applicant for recommendation of disciplinary proceeding against him under Memo No. CON190/4C-30/98 dated August 17, 1998 by the respondent no. 2. It has also been stated in the reply that the applicant was considered for promotion and his name was duly recommended along with his eligible colleagues to the Public Service Commission in the year 2004, 2005, 2009 and 2011, but the Public Service Commission did not recommend the name of the applicant for grant of promotion due to poor rating in the A.C.R. on all occasions from the year 2004 to 2011.

ORDER SHEET – (Continuation)

Form No.

Vs

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No. **OA-531 of 2013**

Cusc 110. 021 00	<u> </u>	
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

The reply submitted by the Respondent Public Service Commission, West Bengal indicates that the bench mark for grant of promotion for the post of Sub-Registrar to the post of Additional District Sub-Registrar is rating of 2.00 in A.C.R. during last 5 years and the applicant was rated below 2.00 in A.C.R. of last 5 years on an average. The name of the applicant could not be recommended for promotion due to poor rating in his A.C.R. from the year 2004 to the year 2011.

Since the applicant has already received the pension and other retirement benefits, the issues for consideration of the Tribunal are whether the applicant was denied promotion in an unjustified manner and whether he is entitled to get benefit of promotional post with effect from the date when promotion was lastly denied to him on September 09, 2011.

Having heard Learned Counsel representing all the parties and on consideration of the materials on record, we find that the applicant was not initially granted promotion due to recommendation of disciplinary proceeding against him in the year 1998. The promotion was subsequently denied to the applicant during the period from 2004 to 2011 for poor rating in the A.C.R. It is well settled that promotion is not a matter of right of any government employee, but every government

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

Form No.

 V_{S}

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No. **OA-531 of 2013**

Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal	Office action with date
date of order	with signature	and dated signature of
1	2	parties when necessary.
	employee has a right to be considered for promotion. In	
	the instant case, the applicant was considered for	
	promotion at least four times along with his eligible	
	colleagues during the period from 2004 to 2011, but he	
	was not granted promotion due to poor rating in the	
	A.C.R. The specific contention of Mrs. Mitra is that poor	
	rating in the A.C.R. of the applicant was never	
	communicated and as such the respondents should not	
	have relied upon the poor rating in the A.C.R. of the	
	applicant. On perusal of the pleading in paragraph 6(vi)	
	of the original application, we find that the applicant has	
	pleaded that promotion was denied to him due to his	
	poor rating in A.C.R. Even the contents of the last	
	representation submitted by the applicant for grant of	
	promotion on December 19, 2012 (which was submitted	
	only 04 (four) months before the date of his retirement)	
	indicate that the applicant was aware that promotion	
	was denied to him for poor rating in the A.C.R. Since the	
	applicant had knowledge that the promotion was denied	
	to him due to poor rating in his A.C.R. and since the	
	applicant did not take any step either to know about the	
	specific adverse entries made in the A.C.R. or to pray for	
	review or upgradation of rating in the A.C.R., we are	
	constrained to hold that the applicant has not been	
	prejudiced even if the poor ratings in the A.C.R. were not	
	officially communicated to him. We do not find any merit	
	in the contention made by Mrs. Mitra that the applicant	
	i	

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

Form	Nο
гопп	INO.

Bidyut Kumar Ghosh

Vs

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No. OA-531 of 2013		
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
	should have been granted promotion without acting on	
	the poor ratings in the A.C.R. which was not officially	
	communicated to him, particularly when the applicant	
	had full knowledge about the poor A.C.R. while he was	
	in service.	
	The applicant was repeatedly denied promotion	
	during the period from 2004 to 2011 for poor rating in	
	the A.C.R. Nothing is on record to indicate that the	
	applicant ventilated his grievances about the poor rating	
	in the A.C.R. or for upgradation of his ratings in the	
	A.C.R. at any material point of time till the date of his	
	retirement. Even the last representation dated December	
	19, 2012 annexed to the original application does not	
	indicate any prayer of the applicant either for review of	
	the entries in the A.C.R. or for upgradation of the poor	
	rating in the A.C.R. The upshot of our above observation	
	is that promotion was not denied to the applicant in an	
	unjustified manner as contended by him.	
	As a result, the original application is dismissed.	
	The Urgent Xerox Certified copy of the order if	
	applied for be given to either of the parties on priority	
	basis after fulfillment of all necessary formalities.	
	1	

R. K. BAG

MEMBER(J)

S. K. DAS

MEMBER(A)

Csm