

Ct. 05
Item No.11
01.04.2022
(suvendu)

WPA 7708 of 2021

**Rakhahari Mahato
Vs.
The Director of Pension, Provident Fund
and Group Insurance & Ors.**

Ms. Sreyasree Choudhury
.....for the petitioner

The Affidavit of Service filed in Court today is kept on record.

The petitioner was a graduate Laboratory Instructor of a College who retired from service on 30.11.2008. The petitioner had completed all pension-related formalities prior to his retirement. However, the concerned authorities delayed and released the gratuity as well as arrear pension amount on 13.08.2009 and on 01.06.2016. The petitioner herein seeks interest to be paid on the gratuity as well as arrear pension amount for the interim period of delay in receipt of the arrear pension amount. 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.

The petitioner relies upon an order in *W.P. 17557 (W) of 2017 (Narayan Chandra Saha Vs. State*

of West Bengal and Others) 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.

In view of the above and after hearing learned counsel for the petitioner, 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 cent per annum on the gratuity as well as arrear pension amount calculated from 01.12.2008 till the date of payment. Such payment is to be made within a period of eight weeks from the date of communication of this order.

This writ petition is accordingly disposed without any order as to costs.

Since no affidavit is called for, the allegations made in the writ petition are deemed to have been denied.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be made available to the parties upon compliance with the requisite formalities.

(Moushumi Bhattacharya, J.)