Page 1 of 5

ORDER SHEET WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

Present-

The Hon'ble Smt. Urmita Datta (Sen), Member (J)

& The Hon'ble P. Ramesh Kumar, Member (A)

Case No <u>OA - 191 of 2016</u>

Serial No. and	Jiaul Hoque –Vs- The State of West Bengal & Others. Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date and dated signature
Date of order. 1	2	of parties when necessar 3
<u> </u>	For the Applicant : Mr. A.K. Das Sinha, Advocate.	
	For the Respondents: Mr. M.N. Roy, Advocate.	
	The instant application has been filed praying for	
	quashing of the dismissal order dated 30.05.2003, where by	
	the applicant was dismissed from the service. According to	
	the applicant, he was served with a charge sheet dated	
	22.07.1997 on the allegation of unauthorised absence for the	
	period from 28.06.1994 to 12.12.1994 i.e. for 150 days	
	unauthorised absence. Thereafter Disciplinary Authority	
	had passed one order dated 08.01.2003 whereby he was	
	found guilty of unauthorised absence and over stale of leave	
	and was punished of withholding of two increments with	
	cumulative effect for future purpose also. Subsequently the	
	applicant filed against which the applicant filed appeal	
	before the Appellate Authority. However, the Appellate	
	Authority by exercising his revisional power and had issued	
	a second Show-Cause Notice to the applicant by granting	
	him an opportunity for further reply. However, ultimately	
	the Appellate Authority had dismissed him from the service	
	on the ground of proven unauthorised absence vide order	

Jiaul Hoque

....

Vs. The State of West Bengal & 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 necessar 3
	dated 30.05.2003. However, according to the applicant	
	subsequently he was acquitted from the said criminal case	
	on 29.08.2015. Therefore, as per the applicant, he has	
	acquitted from the criminal case on 29.08.2015. Therefore,	
	as per the applicant, he has acquitted from the criminal case.	
	His dismissal order should be recalled by the Authority since	
	nothing has been done. Being aggrieved with, he has filed	
	this instant application.	
	As per the applicant since he was in jail custody	
	during the concerned period therefore he was absent during	
	that period and already been acquitted from the said charges.	
	The counsel for the respondent has raised preliminary	
	objection on the point of limitation. However, the counsel for	
	the respondent has further submitted that the dismissal	
	order was passed in 2003. However, the applicant never	
	taken this plea that he was in jail custody for the said period	
	and he was absent during the charge period. Even after	
	being acquitted by the criminal case he never approached	
	before the Authority for revocation of the dismissal order.	
	Therefore, the instant application is hopelessly barred by	
	limitation.	

Form No.

Jiaul Hoque

Form No.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Case No. <u>OA - 191</u>	<u>of 2016</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
	Heard both the parties and perused the record. It is	
	noted that the dismissal order was passed on 30.05.2003 on	
	the ground of unauthorised absence and the instant	
	application has been filed in the year 2016 only. It is a	
	settled principle of law that both the disciplinary	
	proceedings and criminal proceedings can go side by side as	
	issues are different in both the proceedings. Even the	
	applicant never approached the Authority after being	
	acquitted by the criminal court though both the proceedings	
	are different issues.	
	During the course of the hearin, g the counsel for the	
	applicant has submitted that in reply to the second Show-	
	Cause Notice, whereby the order for dismissal was proposed	
	by the Appellate Authority, he had taken the plea since he	
	was in jail custody during the said period, he could not be	
	present but that issue was not considered by the Appellate	
	Authority while passing the order. It is observed that the	
	applicant stated in his reply against the Second Show-cause	
	Notice dated 24.03.2003 in paragraph (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (v),	
	(vi) & (vii). It is further observed that paragraph (vii) of	
	the said reply the applicant stated inter alia:	
	"With regard to article of charge No. 1 I	
	beg to submit it is not a denying fact that	

Jiaul Hoque

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Case No. <u>OA - 191</u>	<u>012010</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
	I have been made accused in criminal case	
	and that Cr. Case is still pending only	
	because I have been implicated in Cr. Case	
	in my humble submission I cannot be	
	punished. I submit since I was made	
	accused in a Criminal Case but I was	
	granted anticipatory bail from the	
	Hon'ble High Court Calcutta and as such	
	my absence from duty was not	
	intentionally."	
	From the above, we do not find any submission with	
	regard to his unauthorised absence due to the jail custody	
	rather it has been stated he was granted anticipatory bail	
	from the High Court and as such his absence from the duty	
	was not intentional. Therefore, the submission of the	
	counsel for the applicant is contrary to the reply, filed by the	
	petitioner and it is also noted that the Appellate Authority	
	while passing the order of dismissal had already considered	
	the reply of the applicant and since there was no whisper of	
	his jail custody during that period therefore there is no	
	question of non-consideration of plea of the applicant on this	
	ground. Accordingly, we do not find any reason to	
	entertain the application which is hopelessly barred by	

Case No. <u>OA - 191 of 2016</u>

Form No.

Jiaul Hoque

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

.....

Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date
Date of order.	2	and dated signature
1	Z	of parties when necessary
		3
	<i>limitation and being devoid of merit. Accordingly, the O.A.</i>	
	is dismissed with no order as to cost.	
	P. RAMESH KUMAR URMITA DATTA (SEN)	
	MEMBER (A) MEMBER (J)	
A.K.P.		
L		

Case No. <u>OA - 191 of 2016</u>

Form No.