

**Calcutta High Court
In the Circuit Bench at Jalpaiguri
Appellate Jurisdiction**

Manju Banerjee (Srakhel)

-Versus-

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

...For the Petitioner

Mr. Momenur Rahman

...For the State Respondents

2. The petitioner was an Assistant Teacher of a School, who retired from service on 31.12.2010. The petitioner had completed all pension related formalities. However, the concerned authorities delayed and released arrear pension amount on 30.3.2012. The petitioner herein seeks interest to be paid on the arrear pension amount for the interim period of delay in receipt of the arrear pension amount.

3. There is a considerable delay in filing of the writ petition, which the petitioner seeks to justify by stating that there is no statutory period of limitation and neither parties have suffered due to this delay. It is the submission of the petitioner that accordingly the petition should be allowed.

4. The petitioner relies upon an order in W.P. 17557 (W) of 2017 (Narayan Chandra Saha vs. State of West Bengal & Ors.) wherein a co-ordinate Bench had relied upon the Supreme Court judgment in the case of Union of India vs. Tarsem Singh, reported in (2008) 8 SCC 648 on the issue of limitation relating to payment or

refixation of pay or pension wherein the Apex Court had held that relief may be granted in spite of delay as it does not affect the rights of the third party.

5. In view of the above and after hearing the learned Counsel for the parties, I direct the Director of Pension, Provident Fund and Group Insurance, Government of West Bengal as also the concerned Treasury Officer to pay interest to the petitioner @ 8% per annum on the arrear pension amount calculated from 01.2.2011 till the date of actual payment. Such payment is to be made within a period of eight weeks from the date of communication of this order.

6. With these observations, the writ petition is disposed of.

7. Since, no affidavit-in-opposition has been called for, the allegations made in the writ petition are deemed to have not been admitted by the respondents.

8. There will be no order as to costs.

9. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties, on priority basis.

(Shekhar B. Saraf, J.)