# ORDER SHEET WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

Present-

The Hon'ble Justice Soumitra Pal

& The Hon'ble P. Ramesh Kumar.

Case No -<u>OA-696 of 2015.</u>

Susa	anta Kumar Chowdhury & 11 Others. $-Vs-$ The State of West Bengal & (	Others.
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
15	For the Applicants : Mr. Gourav Haldar, Advocate.	
19.07.2018	Auvocate.	
	For the State Respondents : Mr. Soumendra Narayan Ray,	
	Advocate.	
	In this application, the applicants who had	
	applied for appointment in Group-D posts under the	
	Department of Health & Family Welfare, Hooghly,	
	Government of West Bengal, has prayed for a direction	
	upon the respondent authorities, particularly on the	
	Chief Medical Officer of Health, Hooghly, that is the	
	respondent no3, to initiate fresh selection process and	
	to allow them to participate as they were enlisted in	
	the previous panel.	
	A museur has also have mode for a direction record	
	A prayer has also been made for a direction upon	
	the respondents to complete the selection process	
	immediately in terms of the earlier order passed by the	
	Tribunal.	
	Further, a prayer has been made for a direction	
	upon the concerned respondents to consider the	
	representation submitted by the applicants, being	

### Susanta Kumar Chowdhury & 11 Others.

••••

### Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Case No. OA-696	<u>of 2015.</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
	Annexure-E to the application.	
	The case or the entire issue has a chequered	
	history. It appears that earlier application was moved	
	before the Tribunal being OA-1560 of 2009 Susanta	
	Kumar Chowdhury & 11 OthersVs-Secretary, Health	
	and Family Welfare, which was disposed of by passing	
	an order, being annexure 'C' to the application, the	
	relevant portion of which is as under :	
	"In view of our	
	above observation, we dispose of	
	this application only with a	
	comment following the earlier	
	direction of this Tribunal, that	
	when, the authority shall start	
	the selection process, the	
	petitioner, if really were	
	included in the earlier panel,	
	which was subsequently	
	cancelled, would also be eligible	
	as per order of the Tribunal for	
	consideration for taking part in	
	the new selection process"	

Form No.

#### Susanta Kumar Chowdhury & 11 Others.

Form No.

••••

### Vs.

Case No. <u>OA-696</u>	<u>of 2015.</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
	It needs to be also mentioned that on similar	
	issue applications being OA-1294 of 2000, OA-1295 of	
	2000, OA-1296 of 2000 and OA-808 of 2005 were filed	
	before the Tribunal which were disposed of by an	
	order dated 26 <sup>th</sup> June, 2009 passed by this Tribunal.	
	Being aggrieved the applicants had preferred a	
	writ petition before the Hon'ble High Court being	
	W.P.S.T. 79 of 2010 with C.A.N. 6487 of 2013 with	
	C.A.N. 7229 of 2013 (Suman Chatterjee & OrsVs-State	
	of West Bengal & Ors.) which was allowed by the	
	Tribunal by passing an order, the relevant portion of	
	which is as under :	
	"The learned	
	Advocate of the State-	
	respondents submitted	
	before the learned Tribunal	
	that the panel in question	
	was not accepted by the	
	concerned authority, as a	
	result whereof, no	
	appointment was given from	
	the aforesaid panel, but from	

### Susanta Kumar Chowdhury & 11 Others.

••••

### Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Case No. <u>OA-696 of 2015.</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
	the records we do not find	
	that any decision was taken	
	by the competent authority	
	for not accepting the panel.	
	Since the panel in question	
	was prepared by the	
	members of the Selection	
	Board upon observing the	
	prescribed rules and	
	procedures, the same could	
	not be ignored by the	
	authority concerned.	
	The authority	
	concerned also never	
	cancelled the panel on any	
	ground and the petitioners	
	herein had to wait for a	
	considerable period with the	
	expectation that the vacancies	
	in question would be filled	
	up by the competent	
	authority from the	
	empanelled candidates. After	
	lapse of a considerable	

Form No.

Susanta Kumar Chowdhury & 11 Others.

Form No.

Vs.

Case No. <u>OA-696 of 2015.</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 necessar 3
	period, the petitioners herein	
	ultimately, applied before the	
	learned Tribunal for issuing	
	appropriate direction for	
	filling up the vacant posts of	
	Group 'D' staff from the	
	panel in question prepared	
	by the duly constituted	
	Selection Board.	
	The objections	
	raised on behalf of the State-	
	respondents before the	
	learned Tribunal cannot be	
	sustained for the reasons	
	discussed hereinabove.	
	Therefore, we are of the	
	opinion that the learned	
	Tribunal had no scope to	
	issue any direction for	
	initiating fresh selection	
	process in order to fill up the	
	vacant Group 'D' posts in	
	question.	
	Most unfortunately,	

Susanta Kumar Chowdhury & 11 Others.

Form No.

••••

### Vs.

Order of the Tribunal with signature 2	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessar 3
the panel prepared by the	
duly constituted Selection	
Board was ignored by the	
concerned authority and no	
appointment was given from	
the said panel without any	
valid reason. The reasons	
furnished before the learned	
Tribunal on behalf of the	
State-respondents are	
factually incorrect and also	
not tenable in the eye of law.	
In the aforesaid	
circumstances, the impugned	
order passed by the learned	
Tribunal cannot be sustained	
and the same is accordingly,	
set aside.	
The respondent	
authorities including the	
Chief Medical Officer of	
Health, Hooghly are directed	
•	
	Order of the Tribunal with signature 2 the panel prepared by the duly constituted Selection Board was ignored by the concerned authority and no appointment was given from the said panel without any valid reason. The reasons furnished before the learned Tribunal on behalf of the State-respondents are factually incorrect and also not tenable in the eye of law. In the aforesaid circumstances, the impugned order passed by the learned Tribunal cannot be sustained and the same is accordingly, set aside. The respondent authorities including the Chief Medical Officer of

Susanta Kumar Chowdhury & 11 Others.

Form No.

Vs.

Case No. <u>OA-696 of 2015.</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 necessar 3
	Group 'D' posts for which the	
	selection process was started	
	by constituting the Selection	
	Board for preparation of the	
	panel.	
	We find that	
	under the misconception, the	
	respondent authorities did	
	not act on the basis of the	
	panel in question for the	
	purpose of filling up the	
	Group 'D' posts. We,	
	therefore, direct the authority	
	concerned namely, the Chief	
	Medical Officer of Health,	
	Hooghly to treat the panel in	
	question prepared by the	
	Selection Board consisting of	
	the Chief Medical Officer of	
	Health, Hooghly as proper	
	and valid one for the purpose	
	of filling up the Group 'D'	
	posts.	
	Since a	

### Susanta Kumar Chowdhury & 11 Others.

Form No.

#### Vs.

Case No. <u>OA-696 of 2015.</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
	considerable time has already	
	passed, we direct the Chief	
	Medical Officer of Health,	
	Hooghly to formally accept	
	the panel in question to	
	which her predecessor-in-	
	office was one of the	
	signatories and fill up the	
	vacant Group 'D' posts by	
	issuing letter of	
	appointments to the	
	successful empanelled	
	candidates without any	
	further delay but positively	
	within a period of four weeks	
	from date.	
	Needless to	
	mention that the	
	appointments of the	
	empanelled candidates by the	
	Chief Medical Officer of	
	Health, Hooghly should also	
	be approved by the Director	
	of Health Services, West	

### Susanta Kumar Chowdhury & 11 Others.

Form No.

······

### Vs.

Case No. <u>OA-696 of 20</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
	Bengal and other superior authorities without any delay but positively within a period of two weeks from the date of receiving the relevant papers from the said Chief Medical Officer of Health, Hooghly so that the empanelled candidates may be appointed to the vacant Group 'D' posts at an early date. In swrit petition thus stands allowed. In view of the aforesaid order regarding final disposal of the writ petition, no further order should be passed in the other applications being C.A.N. 6487 of 2013 and C.A.N. 7229 of 2013 and the same are therefore, disposed of."	

### Susanta Kumar Chowdhury & 11 Others.

Form No.

••••

### Vs.

Case No. <u>OA-696</u>	<u>of 2015.</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 necessar 3
	Alleging non-compliance of the directions	
	contained in the said judgment in W.P.S.T. 79 of 2010,	
	a contempt application, being C.P.A.N. 1405 of 2014,	
	was filed before the Hon'ble High Court which was	
	disposed of on 18th February, 2015 by passing an order,	
	the relevant portion of which is as under :	
	"Having heard the	
	learned Advocates of both the	
	parties and considering the	
	averments made in this	
	application, we are of the	
	opinion that the alleged	
	contemnors did not wilfully	
	and deliberately violate any	
	specific direction passed earlier	
	by this Bench.	
	In the aforesaid	
	circumstances, we are not	
	inclined to pass any further	
	direction in this contempt	
	application to the alleged	
	contemnors.	
	This contempt	

### Susanta Kumar Chowdhury & 11 Others.

••••

### Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Case No. <u>OA-696 (</u>	<u>of 2015.</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
	application, therefore, stands	
	disposed of"	
	Learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the	
	applicants submits that as the names of the applicants	
	had figured in the list of candidates appearing in the	
	annexures being marked collectively 'B' to this	
	application, they may directed to be appointed.	
	On scrutiny of Annexure-'B', we find it is a list of	
	candidates numbering 1600 who were called for	
	interview. It is not a list of successful candidates for	
	Group-D posts which the learned Advocate for the	
	applicants could not disagree. However, it is	
	submitted on behalf of the applicants that in such a	
	case a direction may be issued in terms of the prayer	
	'C' for consideration of the representation, being	
	Annexure-'E' to the application. We find from	
	paragraph-4 of the reply filed by the state that as the	
	applicants were not selected for the appointment in the	
	Group-D posts the names of the applicants were not	
	listed in the final selection list for appointment. We	
	find from the rejoinder to the reply, particularly	

Form No.

#### onn nu.

### Susanta Kumar Chowdhury & 11 Others.

Form No.

#### ....

### Vs.

Case No. <u>OA-696 (</u>	<u>of 2015.</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
	paragraph-3 thereof, that such statements have not	
	been denied and disputed.	
	Moreover, we find that the pursuant to the order	
	dated 18th February, 2015 passed by the Hon'ble High	
	Court in Contempt proceedings the matter has been	
	set at rest as it was held that there was no wilful	
	violation of the order passed which means selection	
	was already over.	
	Therefore the prayer of the applicants for consideration of the representation cannot be granted.	
	Hence, the application is dismissed.	
	No order as to costs.	
	(P. RAMESH KUMAR) (SOUMITRA PAL) MEMBER (A) CHAIRMAN	
Sourav.		