

27.03.2025
(D/L 10)
Ct.-19
(Susanta
Samar)

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION**

APPELLATE SIDE

W.P.A. 4281 of 2025

Santiranjana Das & Anr.

-Vs-

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Avishek Prasad,
Mr. Sourodeep Singha,

.... For the Petitioners.

Mr. Biswajit De,
Mr. Debasish Kar,

.... For the State.

Affidavit-of-service filed on behalf of the
petitioners be kept with the record.

The petitioner No.1 was an employee of
Murshidabad District Primary School Council, on
attaining the age of superannuation he has retired
from his service on December 31, 2019.

The petitioner after retirement has become
blind, as such, to represent him in the present writ
petition he has impleaded his son as petitioner no.
2.

Be that as it may, the petitioner had to deposit
a sum of Rs.1,87,987/- as the condition precedent
for disbursement of his retrial dues since it was
alleged that during the tenure of his service, he had
overdrawn the said amount.

It appears from record that such overdrawn
amount was credited to the petitioner No. 1 on
account of wrong pay fixation. The petitioner No. 1

was not responsible for fixation of such erroneous pay scale.

In view of the several decisions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court e.g **SHYAM BABU VERMA -VS- UNION OF INDIA** reported in (1994) 2 SCC 521; **UNION OF INDIA & ORS. -VS- TARSEM SINGH** reported in (2008) 8 SCC 648 and **STATE OF PUNJAB & ORS. -VS- RAFIQ MASIH (WHITE WASHER) & ORS.** reported in (2015) 4 SCC 334, the issue whether such overdrawn amount can be adjusted against the retiral benefits of an employee is no longer *res integra*.

However, to clarify the issue, paragraph '18' of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of **Rafiq Masih (supra)** is quoted below :-

"18. It is not possible to postulate all situations of hardship which would govern employees on the issue of recovery, where payments have mistakenly been made by the employer, in excess of their entitlement. Be that as it may, based on the decisions referred to hereinabove, we may, as a ready reference, summarise the following few situations, wherein recoveries by the employers, would be impermissible in law :

(i) Recovery from the employees belonging to Class II and Class IV service (or Group C and Group D service).

(ii) Recovery from the retired employees, or the employees who are due to retire within one year of the order of recovery.

(iii) Recovery from the employees, when the excess payment has been made for a period in excess of five years, before the order of recovery is issued.

(iv) Recovery in cases where an employee has wrongfully been required to discharge duties of a higher post and has been paid accordingly, even though he should have rightfully been required to work against an inferior post.

(v) In any other case, where the court arrives at the conclusion, that recovery if made from the employee, would be iniquitous or harsh

or arbitrary to such an extent, as would far outweigh the equitable balance of the employer's right to recover."

In view of the discussion made above, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner No. 1 is entitled to the relief as prayed for.

Accordingly, the concerned Director of Pension, Provident Fund and Group Insurance, Government of West Bengal and also the concerned Treasury Officer are directed to release the said amount of Rs. 1,87,987/- along with interest @8% per annum thereon in favour of the petitioner No. 1 from date of deposit of the said amount i.e., July 13, 2020 till the date of refund within a period of eight weeks from the date of communication of this order.

W.P.A. 4281 of 2025 is disposed of with the terms. There shall however be no order as to costs.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties subject to compliance with all requisite formalities.

(Biswajit Basu, J.)