WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

Present-

&

The Hon'ble Smt. Urmita Datta (Sen), Member (J) The Hon'ble P. Ramesh Kumar, Member (A)

Case No OA - 1 of 2020

	Siddhartha Sen & 3 Others –Vs- The State of West Bengal & Other	rs.
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
4	For the Applicants: Mr. M. N. Roy Advocate.	
11.02.2020	Muocate.	
	For the Respondents : Mr. S. N. Ray, Advocate.	
	The instant application has been filed challenging the	
	suspension order dated 22.02.2018 whereby the applicants	
	were placed under suspension with immediate effect under	
	Clause (a) of Sub-rule 1 of Rule 7 of the West Bengal	
	Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules 1971.	
	However, till date neither any charge sheet has been served	
	upon him nor the said suspension order was reviewed or	
	subsistence allowance has been enhanced. During the	
	course of the hearing, the counsel for the applicant has	
	drawn our attention to the judgement passed by the Hon'ble	
	Apex Court in the case of Ajay Kumar Chowdhury -Vs-	
	Union of India and Another reported in (2015) 7 SCC 291	
	and has prayed for extension for benefit of the said	
	judgement by quashing the said order.	
	The counsel for the respondents has submitted that till	
	today no charge sheet has been issued to the applicant nor	
	the suspension order has been reviewed or subsistence	
	allowance has been enhanced.	

Form No.

Ci,	dha	rtha	San	Q, 3	Others
711	иния	гиня	5 en	α	Uniters

Vs. The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Case No. OA - 1 of	2020	
Serial No. and Date of ord1	Order of the Tribunal with signature 2	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessar 3
	The Hon'ble Apex Court while dealing with the issue	
	of suspension has held that the currency of suspension order	
	should not extend beyond three months if within this period	
	the memorandum of charges or charge sheet is not served	
	upon the delinquent officer. In the instant case, admittedly	
	the applicant was put suspension order vide order dated	
	21.11.2018 under Rule 7(1) (a) of the West Bengal Services	
	(Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules 1971, which is as	
	follows:	
	"7. (1) (a)The appointing authority or (b)	
	any authority to which it is subordinate	
	or (c) any authority empowered by the	
	Governor in that behalf may place a	
	Government employee under suspension:	
	(a) Where a disciplinary proceeding or	
	departmental enquiry against him is	
	contemplated or is pending; or	
	(b) Where in the opinion of the authority	
	aforesaid, he has engaged himself in	
	activities prejudicial to the interest of the	
	security of the State; or	
	(c) Where a case against him in respect	
	of any criminal offence is under	
	investigation or trial.	
	Provided that where the order of	
	suspension is made by an authority lower	

_		
FΛ	rm	Nο

Siddhartha Sen & 3 Others

Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Office action with date

and dated signature

of parties when necessary

Case No. OA - 1 of 2020

Serial No. and

Date of ord1

than the appointing authority, such authority shall forthwith report to the appointing authority the circumstances in which the order was made."

Order of the Tribunal with signature

2

From the above, it is clear that an employee can be put under suspension under Rule 7(a) if there is a contemplation of the Departmental Proceedings against him. However, as per settled Law, it cannot be continued beyond a reasonable period of time. Further if someone has to be continued under suspension then suspension order should be reviewed within three months and the authority concerned should consider whether the suspension would be continued or not and if they would decide to continue suspension then subsistence allowance has to be enhanced. But in the instant case, admittedly no review has been made nor subsistence allowance has been enhanced even no disciplinary proceedings has been initiated against the applicants. As the suspension is not a punishment but to keep aside the delinquent employee from influencing the witnesses. view of the above, suspension cannot be use as a weapon for punishment purpose. As the rule does not permit such continuation without review, we are of the view that the instant suspension order is not sustainable. Accordingly, the suspension order is quashed and set aside. However, as there is a serious charge against the applicant, the

Form No.

Vs. The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Siddhartha Sen & 3 Others

ase No. OA - 1 o	Order of the Tribu	ınal with signature	Office action with date and dated signature
Date of ord1	2		of parties when necessar
	respondents would be at liber		
	per Rules.		
	Respondents are direct		
	resume his duty within two weeks from the date of receipt of		
	the order.		
	The O.A. is disposed of.		
	P. RAMESH KUMAR MEMBER (A)	URMITA DATTA (SEN) MEMBER (J)	
A.K.P.			