

Sl. No.30
07.02.2025
Suman
Ct. 15

WPA 3782 of 2024

Pampa Chanda
Vs.
Damodar Valley Corporation and Ors.

Mr. Bikash Ranjan Bhattacharyya, Sr. Adv.
Mr. R. Guha Thakurta
Mr. S. Sengupta
Mr. Pulin Chandra Maiti
Ms. Dipa Roy
..for the petitioner

Mr. Srijan Nayak
Ms. Rituparna Maitra
Mr. Partha Sarathi Pal
Mr. Asis Dutta
..for Registrar of Co-operative Society

Mr. Pradip Kumar Tarafdar
Mr. Subir Pal
..for Damodar Valley Corporation

Mr. Ankit Sureka
Mr. Biplab Das
..for respondent no.3.

I am convinced that the petitioner has been terminated from service in an arbitrary and illegal manner, which warrants the intervention of this Court.

The petitioner was appointed under the category of "Salesman/Boy" under the Damodar Valley Corporation Employees Co-operative Stores & Canteen Ltd. (hereafter referred to as the "said Society"), Respondent No. 2. She was issued a

show-cause notice dated November 28, 2023, by the Special Officer of the said Society, who was appointed by the Cooperation Department of the State.

It is essential to quote the relevant portion of the show-cause notice, as follows:

“A joint petition has been submitted against you by some employees of DVC Employees Cooperative Stores and Canteen Ltd. that you are, in group, creating various misunderstanding among the employees of the above named canteen. Some of you are instigating DVC management against one of your colleagues to step down him. In addition you are sharing various important issues related to canteen with other institutions.

You should know that these activities are completely against the integrity of this canteen and out and out against discipline of this canteen.

That is why you are requested to show the cause, that why the disciplinary action is not taken against you from this end within seven working days after receiving this letter.”

In response, the petitioner submitted a letter dated December 5, 2023, in which she stated:

“With due respect, I would like to inform you that, neither I have any idea about the meaningless so called complaints as mentioned in the aforementioned letter under ref(i); nor have I understood anything.

I believe that I am sincere and committed to my colleagues and organization.”

The Special Officer, however, found the petitioner’s response unsatisfactory, and by a letter dated December 11, 2023, the petitioner was suspended, with the following observations:

“Your reply of Ref. No.DVC/ECSC/105 date 28.11.2023 is not satisfactory and the language of the letter is very much derogatory.

So, you have been charged insubordination and disciplinary proceedings will be initiated against you.

During the disciplinary proceedings you will be suspended from your job till the proceedings officially conclude.

This order will take immediate effect.

You will receive the subsistence grant during the period of suspension as per rule 5(28)ibid (34) of the West Bengal Service Rules 1980 (Part-I)."

Subsequently, the petitioner was served with a termination order dated January 17, 2024, which stated:

"Miss Pampa Chanda, whereas a petition lodged against you for your conspicuous activity against the DVC Employees Cooperative Stores and Canteen Ltd. and the staffs of the same, like pilferage of documents and conspiracy against a particular staff of managerial cadre,

and

Whereas you had been advised to show the cause for your such activities which was against the interest of the DVC Employees Cooperative Stores and Canteen Ltd.

and

Whereas the reply of the show cause was not satisfactory and the language of the letter was very much derogatory,

and

Whereas you had been suspended till the disciplinary proceedings had been concluded,

and

Whereas you entered the canteen, during suspension, with a group of outsiders/goons during lunch time and create a pandemonium.

and

Whereas you and some rogues/goons entered with you, attacked the female employees of the DVC Employees Cooperative Stores and Canteen Ltd. during suspension.

and

Whereas after that incident of molestation of a female employee of DVC Employees Cooperative Stores and Canteen Ltd. initiated a criminal case against you with Maniktala Police Station.

and

Whereas a large number of staffs of canteen complained against you that you deliberately entered into the canteen while you were in suspension.

and

Whereas maximum number of canteen workers felt insecured in your presence at the canteen premises as you had some past records.

and

Whereas you forcefully signed your departure of previous day in the attendance registrar during the first day of your suspension, which is a cognizable offence in your part.

*Considering all the facts and the activities mentioned above, Miss Pampa Chanda, is **terminated** from her service of DVC Employees Cooperative Stores and Canteen Ltd., considering the cognizable offence done by Miss Pampa Chanda and continuous conspiracy against the interest of the DVC Employees Cooperative Stores and Canteen Ltd.”*

The petitioner contends that her termination was arbitrary and illegal, as she was not provided an opportunity for a hearing. To support this claim, the petitioner relies on the judgment in ***Gayatri De v. Mousumi Cooperative Housing Society***, reported at **(2004) 5 SCC 90**.

Mr. Ankit Sureka, learned counsel representing the Special Officer, submits that the petitioner was a casual employee, and therefore, a full disciplinary process was not required for her termination. He further argues that the writ petition is not maintainable as the society is a private entity. In the absence of any public law element, the writ court should not intervene in the termination of a contractual employee's services. Additionally, he submits that the petitioner had an alternative remedy available to him.

Mr. Pradip Kumar Tarafder, learned counsel for the Damodar Valley Corporation, argues that

there is no statutory obligation for the Damodar Valley Corporation to operate a canteen and that the petitioner cannot be considered an employee of the Corporation.

In light of the facts of the case and the submissions made by the petitioner, I am compelled to hold that the petitioner's termination did not follow the due process of law. Accordingly, I hereby set aside the termination order dated January 17, 2024.

Addressing the issue of the maintainability of the writ petition, I find merit in the petitioner's argument that when the action complained of is carried out by an officer appointed by the State, such action becomes amenable to writ jurisdiction. In my view, the petitioner's case concerning the maintainability of the writ petition is squarely supported by the judgment reported in ***Gayatri De*** (supra).

Regarding the status of the petitioner as an employee, I am not persuaded by the argument that his employment is casual in nature. The petitioner's appointment letter explicitly states:

"You are appointed as a regular employee of the canteen in the post of Salesman/Boy w.e.f. 27.06.1991."

Additionally, it is evident that the petitioner's monthly salary was determined by the Damodar Valley Corporation through an initial notification dated October 24, 1996, and a subsequent notification dated February 13, 2024. It is undisputed that the petitioner has been employed for the past 32 years without interruption and has consistently received salary as determined by the Damodar Valley Corporation.

It should be noted that the petitioner does not receive her salary directly from the Damodar Valley Corporation. Instead, the Corporation provides a fund to the canteen, from which the petitioner's salary is disbursed.

From a bare reading of the impugned termination order, it is abundantly clear that the grounds for the petitioner's termination were not communicated to her at any stage. The termination order itself introduces grounds for dismissal that were not previously disclosed to the petitioner. It was essential for Respondent No. 3 to provide the petitioner an opportunity to respond to the allegations contained in the termination order. The show-cause notice was based on different grounds, and the termination was later based on entirely new

allegations. This constitutes a clear violation of the principles of natural justice.

The grounds for termination, as mentioned in the order, carry a stigmatising nature.

In the foregoing facts, I am of the firm opinion that the petitioner's service could not be terminated without providing her the opportunity to address the allegations raised in the termination order. Consequently, I set aside the termination order dated January 17, 2024.

It has also come to the Court's attention that the term of the Special Officer who issued the termination order has expired. A regular Board has now been formed to manage the Society. The Board is directed to reinstate the petitioner within 15 days from the date of this order, with 25% back wages. The disciplinary proceedings initiated against the petitioner are hereby set aside.

Accordingly, **WPA 3782 of 2024** is disposed of.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the learned advocates for the parties on usual undertakings.

(Kausik Chanda, J.)