

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA**

Cont. Cas(C). No.102 of 2024

Shri Sadhan Chandra Das, S/O: Nani Gopal Das, Vill: Barjala TRTC
Para, P.S.West Agartala, District- West Tripura

....Petitioner(s)

Versus

1.Dr. Pradeep Kumar Chakraborty, IAS, Department of Home,
Government of Tripura, New Secretariat Building, PO - Kunjaban, P.S
- NCC, Agartala, Tripura.

2.Sri. Amitabha Ranjan, IPS, Director General of Police, Government
of Tripura, Police Headquarter, Fire Brigade Chowmuhani, Agartala,
P.O - Agartala, P.S West Agartala, District - West Tripura.

3.Dr. Kiran Kumar K, IPS, Superintendant of Police, West Tripura
District, Police Headquarter, Fire Brigade Chowmuhani, Agartala, P.O
- Agartala, P.S West Agartala, District - West Tripura

4.Sri. Bogaty Jagadeeswar Reddy, IPS, The Superintendent of
Police, Sephaijala District, At Police Headquarter Bishramganj, P.O
Bishramganj, Sepahijala, Tripura.

....Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Rajib Majumder, Advocate.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. S.M.Chakraborty, Sr. Advocate.
Mrs. P.Chakraborty, Advocate

=B=E=F=O=R=E=

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S. DATTA PURKAYASTHA

=O=R=D=E=R=

06.02.2026

Heard Ld. Counsel of both sides.

[2] Ld. Counsel of the petitioner Mr. R. Majumder has sought
for an adjournment on the ground of physical illness of Ld. Counsel
Mr. A.K.Pal who is also representing the petitioner.

[3] Also heard Ld. Sr. Counsel Mr. S.M. Chakraborty assisted
by Mrs. P. Chakraborty, Ld. Advocate, for the respondents.

[4] By order dated 18.01.2023 passed in WP(C) 851 of 2021, a Coordinate Bench of this Court observed that there were pay anomaly of the petitioner Shri Sadhan Chandra Das with his junior and he was drawing pay of Rs.42,000/- as on 01.07.2019, whereas his junior batch-mates were drawing higher pay i.e. at Rs.43,300/-. In that circumstances, the Court directed the respondents to remove the anomaly and to grant similar pay benefit to the petitioner with further direction to grant ACP-III, which was denied to the petitioner even after completion of 25 years of service before the date of his superannuation. The state preferred an appeal bearing no. WA 84 of 2023 which was dismissed. As the order of the Ld. Writ Court was not complied with, the present contempt petition was filed.

[5] On 14.11.2025, Ld. Sr. Counsel, Mr. Chakraborty by placing one letter dated 11.11.2025 issued by the Under Secretary to Government of Tripura, submitted that the state respondent had conveyed the approval of the Government regarding compliance of the said judgment to remove the pay anomaly by providing ACP-III to the writ petitioner.

[6] Today, a file note No. 10 dated 10.01.2025 is also placed before this Court by Ld. Sr. Counsel Mr. Chakraborty which shows that the benefit of ACP-III has been extended to the writ petitioner, Shri Sadhan Chandra Das, Retd. ASI w.e.f. 26.03.2016 in terms of said judgment and consequently, the pay of the writ petitioner has now been raised from Rs.42,000/- to Rs.46,400/- w.e.f. 01.07.2019 whereas the pay of his junior namely, ASI Haradhan Jamatia, ASI, Shibu Ranjan Debnath, Constable Dulal Chandra Das and Head Constable MD. Maminur Ahaman on the same date, i.e. on 01.07.2019, was Rs.43,300/- or below the same. Therefore, it appears to the Court that the order of the Court has been complied by the respondents.

[7] On 14.11.2025, Ld. Counsel Mr. Anjan Kanti Pal submitted that after granting of said ACP-III, whether there was further pay anomaly subsisting or not, was required to be examined by his client and therefore, he sought for 3 weeks' time. Accordingly, 3

weeks' time was granted and again matter was listed on 12.12.2025, but, on that day again Mr. Pal sought for an adjournment and therefore, the matter has been listed, now, in the month of February, 26. Sufficient scope has already been given to the petitioner for examination of the said fact. No further time can be allowed for this purpose. Accordingly, prayer for adjournment is rejected.

[8] As already discussed above, there is no willful disobedience on the part of the respondents subsisting any more.

[9] Accordingly, the contempt petition is closed.

[10] However, liberty is kept reserved to the petitioner to approach proper forum in accordance with law, if any further grievance persists thereafter to him.

[11] Interim application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of accordingly.

JUDGE

