WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

Present-

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

Case No <u>- OA-974 of 2018.</u>

	Amal Kumar Jana. <u>Vs</u> The State of West Bengal & Others.	T
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
05	For the Applicant : Mr. A. K. Niyogi, Advocate.	
22-07-2019	For the State Respondents : Mr. A. L. Basu, Advocate.	
	The instant application has been filed	
	challenging the impugned order dated 27-12-	
	2016 whereby the Superintendent of Police had	
	ordered inter alia :-	
	"After being heard, Shri	
	Amal Jana, CC Menial of North 24-	
	Parganas district, is hereby	
	demobilized from his assigned	
	service until further order with	
	effect from 28-07-2016 a.m. for	
	involvement in a racket in	
	procuring Indian Passport by	
	producing forged documents and	
	other illegal means. He was	

Form No.

Vs. The State of West Bengal & Others.

Date of order 2 and dated signature	ase No. <u>OA-974 o</u>	of 2018	
No. 612/16 dated 28-07-2016 u/s 465/466/468/471/472/474/120B IPC on 28-07-2016. His act is improper and treacherous which furnished the image of Police Department". As per the applicant, he was appointed in place of Sri Promotha Mondal as a contingent menial in 2004. However he has been demobilized by the impugned order. As per the applicant, he was working for considerable time and he cannot be demobilized as there was no provision for demobilization for permanent Group-D employee. However he may be put under suspension as per Disciplinary Proceeding Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has	Serial No. and Date of order. 1	Order of the Tribunalwith signature 2	of parties when necessar
IPC on 28-07-2016. His act is improper and treacherous which furnished the image of Police Department". As per the applicant, he was appointed in place of Sri Promotha Mondal as a contingent menial in 2004. However he has been demobilized by the impugned order. As per the applicant, he was working for considerable time and he cannot be demobilized as there was no provision for demobilization for permanent Group-D employee. However he may be put under suspension as per Disciplinary Proceeding Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has		arrested in c/w Barasat PS case	
IPC on 28-07-2016. His act is improper and treacherous which furnished the image of Police Department". As per the applicant, he was appointed in place of Sri Promotha Mondal as a contingent menial in 2004. However he has been demobilized by the impugned order. As per the applicant, he was working for considerable time and he cannot be demobilized as there was no provision for demobilization for permanent Group-D employee. However he may be put under suspension as per Disciplinary Proceeding Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has		No. 612/16 dated 28-07-2016 u/s	
improper and treacherous which furnished the image of Police Department". As per the applicant, he was appointed in place of Sri Promotha Mondal as a contingent menial in 2004. However he has been demobilized by the impugned order. As per the applicant, he was working for considerable time and he cannot be demobilized as there was no provision for demobilization for permanent Group-D employee. However he may be put under suspension as per Disciplinary Proceeding Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has		465/466/468/471/472/474/120B	
furnished the image of Police Department". As per the applicant, he was appointed in place of Sri Promotha Mondal as a contingent menial in 2004. However he has been demobilized by the impugned order. As per the applicant, he was working for considerable time and he cannot be demobilized as there was no provision for demobilization for permanent Group-D employee. However he may be put under suspension as per Disciplinary Proceeding Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has		IPC on 28-07-2016. His act is	
Department". As per the applicant, he was appointed in place of Sri Promotha Mondal as a contingent menial in 2004. However he has been demobilized by the impugned order. As per the applicant, he was working for considerable time and he cannot be demobilized as there was no provision for demobilization for permanent Group-D employee. However he may be put under suspension as per Disciplinary Proceeding Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has		improper and treacherous which	
As per the applicant, he was appointed in place of Sri Promotha Mondal as a contingent menial in 2004. However he has been demobilized by the impugned order. As per the applicant, he was working for considerable time and he cannot be demobilized as there was no provision for demobilization for permanent Group-D employee. However he may be put under suspension as per Disciplinary Proceeding Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has		furnished the image of Police	
place of Sri Promotha Mondal as a contingent menial in 2004. However he has been demobilized by the impugned order. As per the applicant, he was working for considerable time and he cannot be demobilized as there was no provision for demobilization for permanent Group-D employee. However he may be put under suspension as per Disciplinary Proceeding Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has		Department".	
menial in 2004. However he has been demobilized by the impugned order. As per the applicant, he was working for considerable time and he cannot be demobilized as there was no provision for demobilization for permanent Group-D employee. However he may be put under suspension as per Disciplinary Proceeding Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has		As per the applicant, he was appointed in	
As per the applicant, he was working for considerable time and he cannot be demobilized as there was no provision for demobilization for permanent Group-D employee. However he may be put under suspension as per Disciplinary Proceeding Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has		place of Sri Promotha Mondal as a contingent	
As per the applicant, he was working for considerable time and he cannot be demobilized as there was no provision for demobilization for permanent Group-D employee. However he may be put under suspension as per Disciplinary Proceeding Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has		menial in 2004. However he has been	
considerable time and he cannot be demobilized as there was no provision for demobilization for permanent Group-D employee. However he may be put under suspension as per Disciplinary Proceeding Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has		demobilized by the impugned order.	
demobilized as there was no provision for demobilization for permanent Group-D employee. However he may be put under suspension as per Disciplinary Proceeding Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has		As per the applicant, he was working for	
demobilization for permanent Group-D employee. However he may be put under suspension as per Disciplinary Proceeding Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has		considerable time and he cannot be	
employee. However he may be put under suspension as per Disciplinary Proceeding Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has		demobilized as there was no provision for	
suspension as per Disciplinary Proceeding Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has		demobilization for permanent Group-D	
Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has		employee. However he may be put under	
instant application. The Counsel for the respondent has		suspension as per Disciplinary Proceeding	
The Counsel for the respondent has		Rule. Being aggrieved with, he has filed the	
		instant application.	
raised the preliminary objection on the point of		The Counsel for the respondent has	
		raised the preliminary objection on the point of	

Amal Kumar Jana.

Form No.

Vs.The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No. OA-974 of 2018

Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunalwith signature	Office action with date and dated signature
Date of order. 1	2	of parties when necessary
1	limitation as well as maintainability of the	3
	·	
	instant application as the applicant was	
	appointed as contingent menial who is not a	
	government employee at all but he was	
	probably engaged as contingency staff.	
	Therefore he can be demobilized at any point of	
	time thus there is no scope of disciplinary	
	proceeding. He has prayed for rejection of the	
	impugned order.	
	We have heard both the parties and	
	perused the records. It is noted that the	
	applicant has been demobilized until further	
	order w.e.f. 27-12-2016 for serious charge of	
	involvement in a racket in procuring Indian	
	Passport by producing forged documents and	
	other illegal means. However he was also	
	arrested and he was in jail custody and one	
	criminal case was pending against him.	
	Moreover, the letter dated 16-08-	
	2004,(Annexure-A) which has been claimed to	
	be an appointment letter of the applicant,	
	cannot be treated as an appointment letter as	
	there is some direction for arrangement of	

Amal Kumar Jana. Form No.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No. OA-974 of 2018				
Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunalwith signature	Office action with date		
Date of order.	2	and dated signature of parties when necessary		
1		3		
	engagement of the applicant in place of another			
	person as a contingent menial staff which is			
	not a post for government employee. However			
	the applicant is not also in a position to show			
	his appointment letter or for any other order by			
	which he was appointed as a permanent			
	Group-D staff as claimed by him. However the			
	application was also filed after 2(two) years.			
	In view of the above, we do not find any			
	reason to entertain the instant application as			
	the applicant not being a government employee			
	can be demobilized at any point of time if there			
	is serious allegation against him for which			
	there is no need of disciplinary proceeding.			
	Even the application is also barred by			
	limitation.			
	Accordingly, the application is			
	dismissed being devoid of any merit as well as			
	being barred by limitation.			
	P. RAMESH KUMAR URMITA DATTA (SEN) MEMBER(A) MEMBER(J)			
Mihir				

	Amai Kumai Jana.
Form No.	
	Vs.
	The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No. <u>OA-974 o</u>	<u>1 2018</u>	
Serial No. and	Order of the Tribunalwith signature	Office action with date
Date of order.	2	and dated signature
1		of parties when necessary 3
		<u> </u>