

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA****AGARTALA****WP(C) 374 OF 2025****Sri Tushar Gon Chowdhury,**S/o Lt. Motilal Gon Chowdhury, resident of Indranagar,
P.S. East Agartala, P.O. Indranagar, District-West Tripura.

..... Petitioner(s);

V E R S U S

1. The Managing Director,

Tripura State Co-operative Bank Ltd.

Post Office Chowmuhani, Agartala, Tripura, Pin-799001.

2. The General Manager,

Tripura State Co-operative Bank Ltd.

Post Office Chowmuhani, Agartala, Tripura, Pin-799001

.....Respondent(s);

For the Petitioner(s)

: Mr. Haridas Datta, Advocate.

: Mr. Anirban Bhattacharjee, Advocate

For the Respondent(s)

: Mr. Sandip Datta Chowdhury, Advocate.

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. DATTA PURKAYASTHA**JUDGMENT AND ORDER(ORAL)****22/05/2026**

Heard learned counsels of both sides.

2. The case of the petitioner is that he joined in the service as Office Assistant in the year 1975 under the Tripura State Co-operative Bank Ltd. By passage of time, he was promoted to different posts and ultimately, in the year 2015, he went on retirement as Branch Manager. At the time of his retirement, there was no beneficial scheme for the employees or officers of the bank regarding post retiral benefits. However, a scheme was thereafter formulated by the bank authority which came into force w.e.f. 01.12.2022 prescribing some amount of financial benefit such as Rs.10,000/-, Rs.8000/- and Rs.6000/- per month for different categories of retired officers and employees. In the said scheme, there is also a provision at Clause-13 that in case of any dispute or any grievance of the beneficiary,

he/she may proceed to the Chairman of the Trust of TSCBL and raise the issue of concern for immediate resolution and the decision of the Chairman would be final.

3. The respondents made further amendment of the said scheme vide Memorandum dated 03.06.2023, wherein a Clause was incorporated that such an extension of financial benefit is subject to condition that the employee or his/her any of the beneficial family members should not be defaulter against any pending loan taken from the Tripura State Co-operative Bank Ltd. by the name of self or by any of the family members of the employee. Family member of the employee means spouse, son and daughter. It is the grievance of the petitioner that just because the son of the petitioner took a loan from the said bank, such benefit has not been extended to the petitioner and incorporation of such Clause is also illegal for the reason that for the fault of the children of the employee, the employee cannot be made sufferer.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner, therefore, arguing in the same line submits that the writ petition may be allowed. However, on query of the Court, learned counsel failed to satisfy the Court that the petitioner as per the said scheme approached earlier to the Chairman of the said bank as per Clause-13 of the scheme, as indicated above. Though, according to learned counsel, verbally the petitioner approached the Chairman.

5. Court is not satisfied with such submission as there is no such assertion in this writ petition that the petitioner had approached the Chairman of the bank and even no document in this regard also submitted before the Court.

6. Learned counsel, Mr. Sandip Datta Chowdhury for the respondents submits that he has no objection if the writ petition is disposed of without making any observation on the merits of the matter and only by giving an opportunity to the petitioner to approach the Chariman as per the scheme itself.

7. Considering the submissions as discussed above and considering the fact that the scheme itself specifies that in case of any

grievance, the petitioner should first approach the Chairman of the bank which according to this Court, he has failed to substantiate before the Court that he had earlier approached to the Chairman, the petitioner is given liberty to approach the Chairman of the said Tripura State Co-operative Bank Ltd. with his such grievances. Needless to say, on such approach, the Chairman of the bank shall decide the matter expeditiously, and if, any grievance further persists to the petitioner regarding the decision of the Chairman, liberty also will be there to him to approach the appropriate authority in accordance with law.

8. It is also clarified that the Court has in the light of the order passed above, refrains from making any observation on merit of the case at this stage.

9. With such observation, the writ petition is disposed of.

JUDGE

SAIKAT KAR Digitally signed by SAIKAT KAR
Date: 2026.05.25 18:14:36 +05'30'

Sanjay