#### Page **1** of **12**

# ORDER SHEET WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

#### Present-

The Hon'ble Justice Soumitra Pal, Hon'ble Chairman

& The Hon'ble P. Ramesh Kumar, Administrative Member.

#### Case No -<u>OA-642 of 2019.</u>

Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date
Date of order.	2	and dated signature
1	L	of parties when necessary
_	For the Applicants : Mr. S. Ghosh,	3
4	Mr. R. K. Mondal,	
27.11.2019.	Advocates.	
	For the Respondents : Mr. M. N. Roy, Advocate.	
	Auvocate.	
	Let affidavit of service filed be kept on record.	
	In this application the applicants have sought	
	for certain reliefs, the relevant portion of which is as	
	under:-	
	"(a) An order do issue	
	thereby directing the respondent	
	authorities to implement the	
	solemn order dated 13.12.2012	
	passed in O.A. No. 969 of 2012	
	(Tarapada Roy & Others-Vs-	
	The state of West Bengal &	
	Others) in its entirety in	
	exercise of the power under	
	Section 27 of the Administrative	
	Tribunal Act, 1985.	
	(b) An order do issue directing	
	the respondents authorities to	
	forthwith give appointment to	
	the applicants under land losers	
	the applicants under land losers	

Tarapada Roy & 19 Others.

# Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Case No. <u>OA-642</u>	<u>of 2019.</u>	
Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date and dated signature
Date of order. 1	2	of parties when necessary
<b>1</b>	scheme in any civil post such as	3
	Clerk, Group-D, under the	
	establishment without any	
	further delay after condoning	
	the age.	
	(c) A further order do issue	
	directing the concerned	
	respondent authorities to	
	forthwith give appointment to	
	the applicants on compassionate	
	ground in any civil post such as	
	Clerk, Group-D, as soon as the	
	same is made available"	
	It appears that earlier the applicants had moved an	
	application, being OA-969 of 2012, which was disposed	
	of by order dated 13th December, 2012, the relevant	
	portion of which is as under:-	
	"The State Respondent	
	shall examine whether there was	
	any panel for direct recruitment	
	in the State Government	
	including name of the present	
	petitioners, in accordance with	
	Law and if really there is any	
	panel for direct appointment,	
<u> </u>	1	

Form No.

#### Case No. OA-642 of 2019.

Tarapada Roy & 19 Others.

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 of parties when necessar
1		3
	then only, the authority shall	
	consider the appointment of the	
	petitioners subject to available	
	vacancy. If the petitioners have	
	crossed their age for recruitment	
	in Government Service, if their	
	case is considered for	
	appointment, the authority shall	
	also consider the condonation of	
	their age bar. The application is	
	accordingly disposed of"	
	It appears the applicants did not pursue the matter	
	for implementing the said order. Thereafter, the	
	applicants had filed an application, being OA-376 of 2014	
	: (Srinanda Baishnab & 22 OthersVs-The State of West	
	Bengal & Others.), for appointment which was disposed	
	of by passing an order on 29 <sup>th</sup> August, 2017, the relevant	
	portion of which is as under:-	
	"13. It has been sought to	
	be shown in the so called	
	"Reply" that Atul Chandra	
	Roy's case cannot act as a	
	precedence in view of the	
	Notification No. 301-Emp.,	
	302-Emp and 303-Emp. all	

Tarapada Roy & 19 Others.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Case No. <u>OA-642 of 2019</u> .	<u> </u>	
Serial No. and Date of order.	Order of the Tribunal with signature 2	Office action with date and dated signature
1		of parties when necessary 3
	dated 21.08.2002. The Tribunal	
	is not impressed with such	
	stance of the Department. The	
	decision of the Tribunal in Atul	
	Chandra Roy's case (Supra) was	
	arrived at on 02.09.2009 and	
	has subsequently been given	
	effect to by the Government.	
	The concerned Circulars of 2002	
	were very much in vogue at the	
	relevant point of time yet it did	
	not stand in the way for	
	implementation of the	
	Tribunal's Order. As such, it	
	would be very difficult to	
	distinguish between these two	
	cases and the Tribunal sees no	
	reason as to why the same	
	benefit be not given to the	
	Applicants of the present case.	
	14. The application is	
	accordingly disposed of.	
	Necessary steps be taken within	
	a period of 8 (Eight) weeks from	
	the date of communication of	

Case No. <u>OA-642 of 2019</u>.

Tarapada Roy & 19 Others.

# Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Case No. <u>OA-642</u>	<u>of 2019.</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
	this Order""	
	Against the said order the State preferred a writ	
	petition, being W.P.S.T. No. 151 of 2017, which was	
	disposed of on 16th July, 2018 by setting aside the order	
	dated 29th August, 2017, the relevant portion of which is	
	as under:-	
	"It is not in dispute that	
	the respondent nos. 1 to 23 filed	
	an original application on an	
	earlier occasion in the matter of	
	Tarapada Roy & 28 Ors. vs.	
	The Stae of W.B. & Ors (In re:-	
	O.A. No. 969 of 2012).	
	Admittedly the same was	
	disposed of with a direction	
	upon the petitioners to consider	
	the claim of the respondent nos.	
	1 to 23 in the manner recorded	
	therein. No material is brought	
	on record to show that further	
	step was taken by the	
	respondent nos.1 to 23 on the	
	ground of non-compliance of the	
	aforesaid directions and/or	
	wilful disobedience of the above	

Tarapada Roy & 19 Others.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Case No. <u>OA-642 of 2019.</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
	order. No material is produced	
	before the Court to show that	
	there was a fresh cause of action	
	to file an original application on	
	the selfsame cause of action once	
	again.	
	We find substance in the	
	submissions made on behalf of	
	the petitioners before us that the	
	filing of second original	
	application was not permissible	
	on the selfsame cause of action.	
	Rather the original application	
	which gives rise to this writ	
	application was filed by the	
	respondent nos. 1 to 23 on the	
	selfsame cause of action after	
	expiry of about 2 years.	
	Therefore, the original	
	application which gives rise to	
	this writ application should	
	have been dismissed on the	
	aforesaid sole ground.	
	That apart a belated claim	
	lodged afresh after introduction	

Tarapada Roy & 19 Others.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Case No. <u>OA-642 of 2019</u> 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
	of a new scheme by virtue of the	
	notification nos. 301/302/303	
	EMP dated August 21, 2002	
	could not be entertained.	
	With regard to the	
	decision of <b>Maharaj Krishan</b>	
	Bhatt & Anr. (supra) we find	
	that the same relates to scope to	
	perpetuate illegality. In view of	
	the distinguishable facts and	
	circumstances of this case the	
	same does not help the	
	respondent nos. 1 to 23.	
	Similarly, in the matter of	
	C. Lalitha (supra) the issue	
	was not to examine scope of	
	initiating a proceeding taking	
	into consideration the principle	
	of constructive res judicata.	
	In the matter of K. C.	
	Sharma & Ors. (supra) the	
	above issue was not under	
	consideration. Therefore, none	
	of the aforesaid cases helps the	
	respondent nos. 1 to 23 in view	

Case No. OA-642 of 2019.

Tarapada Roy & 19 Others.

# Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Case No. <u>OA-642</u> o	<u>f 2019.</u>	
Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date and dated signature
Date of order. 1	2	of parties when necessary 3
	of the distinguishable facts and	
	circumstances and the issue	
	involved in the original	
	application.	
	In view of the discussions	
	and observations made	
	hereinabove, the order	
	impugned to this writ	
	application stands quashed and	
	set aside.	
	This writ application is,	
	thus, disposed of accordingly.	
	There will be, however, no	
	order as to costs.	
	Urgent photostat	
	certified copy of this judgment,	
	if applied for, be given to the	
	parties, on priority basis"	
	Aggrieved the applicants filed a Special Leave	
	Petition before Hon'ble Supreme Court which was	
	dismissed on 22 <sup>nd</sup> October, 2018. Thereafter, the	
	applicants had filed a Review Application before the	
	High Court, being RVW 72 of 2019 for reviewing the	
	order dated 16th July, 2018 passed in W.P.S.T. No. 151 of	
	2017 which was dismissed by order dated 12th July, 2019,	
L		ıl

Case No. <u>OA-642 of 2019.</u>

Tarapada Roy & 19 Others.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Case No. <u>OA-642</u>	<u>of 2019.</u>	
Serial No. and Date of order.	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date and dated signature
1	Ζ	of parties when necessary 3
	the relevant portion of which is as under:-	
	"the main grounds for	
	review are that there is a clear	
	error apparent on the face of	
	the judgment and order and	
	that the Court erred in fact	
	and in law while holding that	
	no relief could be given to the	
	applicants (being the review	
	applicants herein) as the relief	
	they sought for was barred by	
	the principle of res judicata.	
	Even a bare perusal of	
	the impugned judgment and	
	order reveals that the Court	
	look into consideration that the	
	respondent nos. 1 to 23 had	
	filed an original application on	
	an earlier occasion in the	
	matter of Tarapada Roy & 28	
	Ors. vs. The State of West	
	Bengal & Ors. (In re: O.A.	
	No. 969 of 2012).	
	Admittedly, the same	
	was disposed of with a	

Form No.

Case No. OA-642 of 2019.

Tarapada Roy & 19 Others.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Case No. <u>OA-642 of 2019</u>		Office action with date
Serial No. and Date of order. 1	Order of the Tribunal with signature 2	and dated signature of parties when necessar 3
	direction upon the petitioners	
	to consider the claim of the	
	respondent nos. 1 to 23 in the	
	manner recorded therein. No	
	material was brought on	
	record to show that further	
	step was taken by the	
	respondent nos. 1 to 23 on the	
	ground of non-compliance of	
	the above directions and/or	
	wilful disobedience of the	
	above order. No material was	
	produced before the Court to	
	show that there was a fresh	
	cause of action to file an	
	original application on the self-	
	same cause of action once	
	again.	
	Under such	
	circumstances as stated above,	
	the Court proceeded to pass the	
	judgment and order dated 16 <sup>th</sup>	
	July, 2018, by quashing the	
	order impugned in the writ	
	petition and setting it aside.	

Tarapada Roy & 19 Others.

.... Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Case No. <u>OA-642</u>	<u>of 2019.</u>		
Serial No. and Date of order. 1	Order of the Tribuna 2	al with signature	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary 3
	We have n	ot noticed any	
	of the ingredien	ts present in	
	the judgment an	d order dated	
	16 <sup>th</sup> July, 2018,	which would	
	bring the same	e within the	
	scope of bein	1g reviewed	
	following the	principles	
	analogous to Or	der XLVII of	
	the Code of Cia	vil Procedure,	
	1908.		
	We, there	fore, do not	
	find any merit	in the review,	
	which is liable to	o be dismissed	
	and is accordin	gly dismissed	
	along with CAN	3513 of 2019	
	Since we find that the is	sue was dealt with by the	
	High Court in W.P.S.T. No. 1	51 of 2017 and thereafter,	
	the matter was before the Ho	on'ble Supreme Court, the	
	Tribunal has no jurisdiction	n to re-open the issue.	
	Therefore, the application is di	smissed.	
Sourav.	(P. RAMESH KUMAR) MEMBER (A)	(SOUMITRA PAL) CHAIRMAN	

Tarapada Roy & 19 Others.

#### ....

#### Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Case No. <u>OA-642 of 2019</u>.

Case No. <u>OA-642 of 2</u>	<u>2019.</u>		
Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunal with signature	Office action with date	
Date of order.	2	and dated signature	
1		of parties when necessary 3	