



TRHC010019382025

2026:THC:559

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA**

W.P.(C) No.670 of 2025

Sri Pritam Das,
S/O Sri Pranab Das,
Resident of Indranagar,
Opposite of Gomati Dairy Milk,
P.O. Kunjaban, P.S. NCC,
District West Tripura.

----- Petitioner(s)

Versus

- 1. Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd.**
Represented by its Manager (IR),
Corporate Industrial Relations,
ONGC (Tel Bhawan), Dehradun.
- 2. The Chief Manager (F & A),**
CRP Section, Shed No.4,
Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd.
Tel Bhawan, Dehradun.
- 3. The Asset Manager,**
Oil and Natural Gas Corporation Ltd.,
Tripura Asset, R & P Section,
Badharghat Complex, Agartala.
- 4. Oil & Natural Gas Corporation Ltd.**
Tripura Asset, represented through the Asset Manager,
Tripura Asset, Agartala, West Tripura.
- 5. The Head, HR-ER Section,**
ONGC Tripura Asset, Agartala,
West Tripura.
- 6. The Head, Drilling Services,**
ONGC Tripura Asset, Agartala,
West Tripura.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Purusuttam Roy Barman, Sr. Adv,
Mr. Kawsik Nath, Adv.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Paromita Dhar, Adv.

Date of Hearing &
Judgment and Order: 04.05.2026

Whether fit for
Reporting : NO

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BISWAJIT PALIT

Judgment & Order(Oral)

Heard Learned Senior Counsel, Mr. P. Roy Barman assisted by Learned Counsel, Mr. K. Nath appearing on behalf of the petitioner and also heard Learned Counsel, Mr. P. Dhar appearing on behalf of the respondents.

02. At the time of hearing, Learned Senior Counsel drawn the attention of the Court that on the basis of Offer of appointment dated 21.03.2023, the petitioner joined as a Junior Technician (Diesel Mechanical) under the Tripura Asset, ONGC, Agartala (Annexure-A) and since then he has been discharging his duties with utmost satisfaction of the authority. But all on a sudden, the petitioner fell ill and was suffering from psychiatric health conditions, including severe anxiety disorder, panic attacks, and stress related psychological disturbances for which he had to take leave on medical ground and was undergoing treatment w.e.f. from 22.12.2024 to 08.04.2025. The petitioner resumed his duty again on 09.04.2025 and submitted all the relevant documents in support of his treatment, but he was not allowed to join in his duty and he was further informed that he will be transferred to NG-3 subject to consideration of his medical leave, but the respondents compelled him to perform his duty to NG-2. On 28.07.2025 the respondents called the petitioner and advised him to join in his duty with assurance that they will transfer the petitioner to NG-3. On

31.07.2025 the respondents issued an office order by which the petitioner was transferred to LM of Rig NG-3 and accordingly, he joined in his duty and since w.e.f. 31.07.2025 to 12.08.2025 the petitioner discharged his duty.

It was further submitted that as per schedule of shift he went to serve his shift duty and w.e.f. 26.08.2025 and upto 05.09.2025 he performed his duty but due to toothache, he could not perform duties for four days and after that he was supposed to perform duties again on the next shift w.e.f. 23.09.2025 but at the time of proceeding on duty, he met with an accident and could not join in his duties and he had to undergone medical treatment and during that period he went to his office for informing about his physical condition and his further shift was supposed to be commenced from 21.10.2025. So, he submitted an application for transfer him to an office based post on medical grounds as he was undergoing treatment. But his representation has not been considered by the authority and since January 2025 his salary has been withheld by the respondents-authority. So, under the compelling circumstances, the writ petition was filed by him.

03. The respondents contested the petition by filing counter-affidavit denying the assertions of the petitioner and submitted that since the petitioner is serving as a technical staff, so, on medical grounds, there was no scope to consider

his representation and urged for dismissal of the writ petition.

04. An additional-affidavit was filed by the petitioner annexing some documents. At the time of hearing, Learned Senior Counsel also drawn the attention of the Court referring Annexure- H, I, J and drawn the attention of the Court that since the petitioner has been suffering from fear psychosis, so, a direction may be given to the respondents to consider his representation and to post him to office till his recovery, so that on recovery he may discharge his duties sincerely.

05. Learned Counsel, Smt. Parmota Dhar appearing on behalf of the respondents submitted that since the petitioner is serving as a technical staff, so, it is very difficult on the part of the respondents to arrange his posting to office and the petitioner knowing fully the terms and condition accepted the Offer of Appointment. However, she fairly submitted that a direction may be given to the petitioner to submit his representation. In that case, scope may be given to the respondents to consider the representation of the petitioner for a certain period.

05. So, after hearing both the sides, it appears to this Court that the petitioner is serving as a technical staff. So, there is no scope to pass any direction to the respondents to engage/appoint him to a non-technical post but admittedly the petitioner is suffering from some sort of mental anxiety and fear psychosis which may be due to some working

hazards. So, in such a situation, there is no scope on the part of this Court to issue any rule directing the respondents to appoint the petitioner to a non-technical post for which he was not engaged. At the same time, it is also true that if the petitioner with ailment performs his duties, in that case he would not be able to render his best service for the department and ultimately, the respondent-department also would not get the service of the petitioner according to requirements.

However, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, it is ordered that the petitioner shall submit one representation within a period of seven days from the date of receipt of the copy of this judgment/ order to the respondents-authority who thereupon shall consider the representation of the petitioner preferably for a period of one year or till recovery, so that on recovery the petitioner may again join to his assigned post and may discharge his functions properly to his assignment for which he was engaged to the satisfaction of the authority.

With this observation, this writ petition stands disposed of.

Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

JUDGE

PURNITA DEB
Digitally signed by
PURNITA DEB
Date: 2026.05.05 13:30:48
+05'30'
Purnita