WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

Present-

The Hon'bleMrs.UrmitaDatta (Sen), Member(J) The Hon'bleMr. P. Ramesh Kumar, Member (A)

Case No <u>- OA-143 of 2016.</u>

Netai Chand Bisai. Vs The State of West Bengal & Others.			
Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date	
Date of order.1	2	and dated signature of parties when necessary	
		3	
14	For the Applicant : Mr. K. K. Bhattacharya, Advocate.		
22-07-2019			
22-07-2013	For the State Respondents : Mr. D. Koley, Advocate.		
	The instant application has been filed		
	praying for the following reliefs :-		
	a) To give a direction upon the		
	respondent and/or their		
	agents and servants to give		
	approval of the appointment		
	of the applicant from the date		
	of the preparation of the panel		
	on 27-08-2002, by treating his		
	service of such period		
	notionally, so that the applicant receive pension after		
	his retirement forthwith.		
	b) Any other appropriate order or		
	orders, direction or directions as		

Netai Chand Bisai.

Form No.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No. OA-143 of 2016

Serial No. and Date of order. 1	Order of the Tribunalwith signature 2	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary 3
	this Hon'ble Tribunal may deem	
	fit and proper to protect the	
	right of the applicants.	
	As per the applicant, being a schedule caste	
	candidate, he was sponsored by the	
	Employment Exchange and appeared for	
	interview for the post of Night Guard on 04-01-	
	1999 and subsequently vide panel dated 27-08-	
	2002, he was selected for the said post.	
	However he was appointed as Night Guard vide	
	order dated 7th July, 2009(Annexure-D) at the	
	age of 52 years 9 months and 2 days. In the	
	mean time vide Memo dated 26th June, 2009	
	and subsequently vide order dated 22-01-2015	
	(Annexure-E), the Director of Social Welfare,	
	West Bengal had communicated that at the	
	time of the appointment the applicant was	
	beyond age limit of 45 years as stipulated for	
	Schedule Caste candidates, however as there	
	was some delay for publishing of panel and	
	issuance of appointment letter. Therefore	
	excess age of 52 years 9 months and 2 days	
	was condoned in terms of Rule 8 of W.B.S.R.	

Form No.

Vs.

Netai Chand Bisai.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No. OA-143 of 2016

<u> 2016</u>	260
Order of the Tribunalwith signature 2	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary 3
Part-1 and subsequently he retired on 31-10-	
2016. However, after retirement he could not	
get any pension due to the lack of eligible	
qualifying service. Being aggrieved with, he has	
filed the instant application.	
Though enough opportunity was granted	
required. However the applicant was appointed	
at the age of 52 years 9 months and 2 days and	
obviously he could not complete the 10 years	
qualifying service as required under Rules for	
the purpose of receiving pension. However he	
never challenged the same while he was	
appointed but joined the said post knowing	
fully that the purpose of pension, tenure of 10	
years minimum qualifying service is required. It	
has been further submitted that the applicant	
was even appointed beyond the maximum age	
stipulated for Schedule Caste candidates i.e. 45	
years but he was granted age relaxation benefit	
	Part-1 and subsequently he retired on 31-10-2016. However, after retirement he could not get any pension due to the lack of eligible qualifying service. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. Though enough opportunity was granted to the respondent but no reply has been filed. However the Counsel for the respondent has submitted that for the purpose of pension minimum 10 years qualifying service is required. However the applicant was appointed at the age of 52 years 9 months and 2 days and obviously he could not complete the 10 years qualifying service as required under Rules for the purpose of receiving pension. However he never challenged the same while he was appointed but joined the said post knowing fully that the purpose of pension, tenure of 10 years minimum qualifying service is required. It has been further submitted that the applicant was even appointed beyond the maximum age stipulated for Schedule Caste candidates i.e. 45

_			
⊢∧	rm	No.	
ıv		INU.	

Netai Chand Bisai.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No. OA-143 of 2016

Case No. <u>OA-143 o</u>		
Serial No. and Date of order. 1	Order of the Tribunalwith signature 2	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary 3
	at the time of his appointment. Therefore as per	
	Rules he was not granted any pension.	
	We have heard both the parties and	
	perused the records. It is noted that the	
	applicant was admittedly appointed almost at	
	the age of 53 years which he never challenged	
	at the time of his joining of his service and as	
	per Rules a government employee require	
	minimum 10 years of qualifying service for the	
	purpose of pension. As he could not complete	
	minimum 10 years of qualifying service at the	
	time of retirement, therefore, at this stage, he	
	cannot asked for the pension, which is not	
	permissible as per Rules. Thus we do not find	
	any merit to entertain the instant application.	
	Accordingly, the OA is dismissed being	
	devoid of merit.	
	P. RAMESH KUMAR URMITA DATTA (SEN) MEMBER(A) MEMBER(J)	
Mihir		

	Netai Chand Bisai.	
Form No.		
	Vs.	
	The State of West Bengal & Others.	

Case No. <u>OA-143 o</u>	<u>f 2016</u>	
Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunalwith signature	Office action with date and dated signature
Date of order.	2	of parties when necessary
1		3