



**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA**

WA No.04 of 2026

Sri Tridiv Nath, S/O Late Prasanta Kr. Nath, Resident of Quarter No.Type-III/A1, Kunjaban Extension, Agartala, P.O. Kunjaban, P.S. NCC, Sub-Division: Sadar, District- West Tripura

.....Appellant(s);

Versus

1. The State of Tripura represented by the Chief Secretary to the Government of Tripura, having his office at New Secretariat Complex, Agartala, P.O. New Secretariat, P.S. New Capital Complex, Sub-Division: Sadar, District- West Tripura, PIN- 799010
2. The Secretary, Department of Public Works Department, Government of Tripura, having his office at New Secretariat Complex, Agartala, P.O. New Secretariat, P.S. New Capital Complex, Sub-Division: Sadar, District- West Tripura, PIN-799010
3. The Deputy Secretary, Public works Department, Government of Tripura, having of his office at New Secretariat Complex, Agartala, P.O. New Secretariat, P.S. New Capital Complex, Sub-Division: Sadar, District- West Tripura, PIN-799010
4. The Chief Engineer, Public Works Department (Roads and Bridges), Government of Tripura, having his office at New Secretariat Complex, Agartala, P.O. New Secretariat, P.S. New Capital Complex, Sub-Division: Sadar, District- West Tripura, PIN-799010
5. Sri Rajib Kr. Paul, Assistant Electrical Inspector, Office of the Electrical Inspector, Power Department, Government of Tripura, Gorkhabasti, P.O. Kunjaban, P.S. New Capital Complex, Sub-Division: Sadar, District- West Tripura, PIN-799009

.....Respondent(s)

For Appellant(s) : Mr. Anupam Pal, Advocate.

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Karnajit De, Addl. G.A.

**HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE MR. M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE BISWAJIT PALIT**

Order

22/06/2026

Heard counsel for the appellant.

2. The Appeal is filed challenging the Order dt.24.04.2025 of the learned Single Judge in WP(C) No.49/2025.



3. Before the learned Single Judge, on two separate occasions i.e. on 23.04.2025 and 24.04.2025, there was no representation on behalf of the petitioner/appellant herein.

4. Counsel for the appellant states that he was not in town at that point of time, and that there was a mistake on his part in not appearing before the learned Single Judge on the said dates. The reason for counsel's absence is genuine and we accept the same.

5. The matter relates to stepping up of pay of the petitioner/appellant herein on par with that of his junior.

6. The learned Single Judge has taken the view that it is a premature case and there was no cause of action for the petitioner, and that it was not a fit case to be entertained.

7. We disagree with the said view of the learned Single Judge since the petitioner has a cause of action if his junior is being paid less than him.

8. It cannot also be said that it was a premature case, and that it was not a fit case to be entertained.

9. In this view of the matter, the Order of the learned Single Judge in the Writ Petition is set aside, and the matter is remitted back to the learned Single Judge for fresh consideration on merits.

10. The Writ Petition is restored to the file of the learned Single Judge.

11. Writ Appeal stands disposed of. No costs.

(BISWAJIT PALIT, J)

(M.S. RAMACHANDRA RAO, CJ)

Pijush/

PIJUSH KANTI NAG

Digitally signed by PIJUSH KANTI NAG
Date: 2026.06.22 13:14:30 +05'30'