

25.09.2023

31

ss

W.P.A. 1396 of 2022

Baidyanath Jha

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & ors.

Mr. Kamalesh Bhattacharya

Mr. Anindya Bhattacharya

... for the petitioner

Mr. Shamim ul Bari

... for the State

Heard learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the parties.

This is an application under Article 226 of the Constitution of India wherein the writ petitioner is aggrieved by an order dated July 31, 2019 passed by the District Inspector of Schools (S.E.), Kolkata wherein his representation dated November 12, 2018 for pay fixation in terms of para 12(4) of ROPA, 1998 read with G.O. No.759-SE(S)/2P-1/09 dated 30.7.2009 was rejected.

Upon perusal of the impugned order it is very clear that the authority concerned has taken into consideration all the relevant Government Orders and held that the representation of the petitioner cannot be considered as the relaxation that was made in the case of Assistant Teachers was only for Teachers who have joined in the year 2002 or subsequently.

It is an undisputed fact of the present case that the petitioner had joined in the year 2000 and he is, therefore, not eligible for the benefit and relief he has sought for.

In light of the above, this Court finds that there is no need for any interference in the impugned order.

Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed.

No order as to costs.

All parties are to act on the basis of *website* copy of this order.

(Shekhar B. Saraf, J.)