ORDER SHEET

WEST BENGAL ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

Present-

The Hon'ble Mrs. Urmita Datta (Sen), Member(J) The Hon'ble Mr. P. Ramesh Kumar, Member(A)

Case No <u>- OA- 348 of 2015.</u>

Sandip Maiti. Vs The State of West Bengal & Others.

Sandip Maiti. <u>Vs</u> The State of West Bengal & Others.					
Serial No. and Date of order.	Order of the Tribunal with signature 2	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary			
1		3			
04	For the Applicant : Mr. S.Roy, Ld. Advocate.				
18/06/2019					
18/00/2019	For the State Despendents: Mr. S.V. Mondal				
	For the State Respondents: Mr. S.K. Mondal, Ld. Advocate.				
	The instant application has been filed				
	praying for following relief;				
	a) A Mandatory order directing the respondents				
	concerned to give appointment to the petitioner				
	in the Government service under Group 'C'				
	post.				
	b) To rectify the order being HAD/2C-01-14/A				
	1105 dated 27.02.2014 and also the order				
	being No.CMOH/Pas-Mid/Gr-D/1750 dated				
	05.03.2014 being annexure "G" and "H"				
	respectively.				
	c) To direct the respondents to authenticate and				
	transmit the records of the petitioner's case as				
	well as Government Orders and/or Circular				
	which are relevant in the instant case and				
	after perusing the records of the petitioner's				
	case and orders and/or circulars a consciable				
	justice to render to the petitioner.				
	d) To pass other order or order or direction or				
	directions as your Lordships made deem fit				

ORDER SHEET

Form No.

Sandip N	Maiti.
----------	--------

Vs.The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No OA- 348 of 2015.

Serial No. and Date of order.	Order of the Tribunal with signature 2	Office action with date and dated signature of parties when necessary 3
	and proper.	
	As per the applicant, he is the brother of the	
	deceased employee who died on 16.01.1998 leaving	
	behind his parent and three brothers.	
	Subsequently, the applicant applied for	
	compassionate appointment and ultimately vide	
	order dated 26.02.2014 he was found fit for	
	appointment in the office of Khirpai BPHC under	
	Ghatal Sub-Division as General Duty Attendant	
	(Group D) as per existing rules and was offered for	
	the same. The applicant had also joined the said	
	post on 11.03.2014 (forenoon). However, according	
	to the applicant all along he had applied for Group C	
	posts. But, he was offered with the post of Group D.	
	Being aggrieved with, he has challenged the order	
	dated 27.02.2014 and 05.03.2014. The counsel for	
	the respondent has vehemently submitted that	
	though the applicant had applied for Group C post.	
	However, he was found fit for the post of General	
	Duty Attendant(GDA) Group D as per the existing	
	rules and circulars and was offered for the said post	
	which he had accepted and joined. Therefore, after	
	joining the said post without any protest, he cannot	
	challenge the order of appointment at the	
	subsequent time.	
	We have heard the parties and perused the	

ORDER SHEET

	Sandip Maiti.
Form No.	••••

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Others.

Case No OA- 348 of 2015

Case No <u>OA- 348 o</u>	<u>1 2015.</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
	records. It is an admitted fact that the applicant	
	had already joined the said post as per the offer	
	letter dated 27.02.14 and 05.03.14 in the post of	
	Group D without any protest. However,	
	subsequently he had approached this Tribunal	
	challenging the said offer of appointment. As he has	
	already joined the said post of Group D, in our	
	considered view, he has already waived his right to	
	challenge the said order. Further, the main purpose	
	of the compassionate appointment is to provide	
	immediate need of financial assistance to overcome	
	financial crisis caused due to the sudden death of	
	the bread earner. As the said purpose has already	
	been achieved by way of offering the post of Group	
	D which, the applicant had already accepted,	
	therefore, he has no vested right to ask for any	
	specified post. Accordingly, we do not find any	
	reason to interfere with the decision of the authority.	
	Therefore, in view of the above, the OA is dismissed	
	being devoid of merit with no order as to cost.	
GM	P. RAMESH KUMAR URMITA DATTA (SEN) MEMBER (A) MEMBER(J)	