

11th July,
2025
(AK)
36

C.P.A.N 95 of 2025
in
WPA 1735 of 2024

Mahaprakash Math
Vs.
Smt. Supriti Gupta and another

Ms. Nilanjana Adhya
...for the petitioner.

Mr. Sahasrangshu Bhattacharya
Mr. Tapan Bhanja
...for the alleged contemnors.

1. Learned counsel appearing for the alleged contemnors submits that the entire amount of principal dues as well as interest in accordance with law and the extant Rules has been disbursed in favour of the petitioner.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a charitable organization and there was no fault on the part of the petitioner in the prolonged delay in disbursement of the amount in favour of the petitioner.
3. It is submitted that the default, if any, was on the part of the Post Master General and the agent of the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel also seeks to rely on the India Post Payments Bank (IPPB) Customer Compensation Policy revised on August 10, 2020.
5. However, from a bare perusal of the order under contempt dated March 7, 2024 passed in WPA 1735 of 2024, it is found that the direction on the alleged contemnors were to settle the claim of the petitioner upon giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner through its authorized representative within a limited period and, immediately after such settlement, the amount due to the petitioner to be disbursed to the petitioner at the earliest.
6. It was also kept open to the respondent no.5 in the writ petition to decide any dispute, if so arises, regarding such claim.
7. Conspicuously, in paragraph no.12 of the said order, the parties were given the liberty to challenge the ultimate settlement of claim by the Post Master, if need be.
8. The dispute now sought to be raised by the petitioner, inasmuch as the interest paid to the petitioner is not adequate, pertains to a fresh cause of action for which liberty has already been given in the order under contempt itself.

9. However, in view of the compliance of the order, I do not find any further need to keep the contempt application pending.
10. Accordingly, CPAN 95 of 2025 is disposed of as infructuous, by granting liberty to the petitioner to challenge the amount decided by the Post Master to be payable to the petitioner in an appropriately constituted challenge, if the petitioner so deems fit.
11. If such a challenge is preferred, the court taking up the same shall decide the said challenge without being influenced in any manner by any of the observations made herein.

(Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.)