

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE

W.P.A. 2851 of 2025

35
rkd 04.11.2025
Ct.02
DM

Goutam Kajli

-vs-

State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Manas Kumar Ghosh
Ms. Susmita Dey (Basu)

....for the petitioner.

Mr. Amal Kumar Sen,
Ms. Ashima Das (Sil)

....for the State.

Mr. Ayan Banerjee,
Ms. Debasree Dhamali,
Ms. Riya Ghosh,
Ms. Debolina Ghosh

....for the SBSTC.

1. Affidavit-of-service filed on behalf of the petitioner is taken on record.
2. Learned advocate representing the petitioner submits that petitioner is working as Driver in South Bengal State Transport Corporation (for short "SBSTC").
3. Notice of this Court has also been drawn to a notification No. 811-F(P2) dated 3rd March, 2025 issued by the Additional Chief Secretary to the Government of West Bengal, Finance Department whereby remuneration of the drivers who are engaged directly in Government establishments including Boards, Corporations, Statutory Bodies

and Undertakings against sanctioned posts on contractual basis is revised.

4. According to the petitioner in view of his functioning as driver in SBSTC benefit of such notification dated 3rd March, 2025 needs to be extended to consolidate petitioner's remuneration.
5. State respondents and South Bengal State Transport Corporation are represented by learned advocates who have jointly opposed this writ petition on the score that petitioner is not working as driver against sanctioned posts.
6. It is also submitted that petitioner was not engaged directly in SBSTC. Such submissions are made on behalf of the respondents in reference to a letter dated 16th February, 2016 issued on behalf of Bright Security Services which is at page 13 of the writ petition.
7. Having considered the submissions made on behalf of the parties and taking note of the notification dated 3rd March, 2025 and a document dated 16th February, 2016 which is at page 13 of the writ petition, it appears that petitioner was not engaged directly in SBSTC.
8. On perusal of letter dated 16th February, 2016 issued by Bright Security Services it transpires that a work order was issued in favour of Bright

Security Services based on which petitioner was engaged by Bright Security Services on deputation to work as driver in SBSTC. Therefore, by no stretch of imagination it can be construed that engagement of the petitioner as driver was directly made by the concerned authority of SBSTC. It is also not demonstrated before this Court that petitioner's engagement was against sanctioned post.

9. Therefore, no relief can be granted to the petitioner as prayed for.
10. Hence, the writ petition stands dismissed.
11. However, there shall be no order as to costs.
12. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the learned Advocates for the parties on the usual undertakings.

(Saugata Bhattacharyya, J.)