

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE

WPA 15317 of 2025

Tulsi Kumar Pradhan
-versus
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Sakti Pada Jana.
Mr. Subhajhoti Das.
Ms. Sudipta Pramanik.
...For the petitioner.

Mr. S. P. Lahiri.
Mrs. Sanjukta Samanta.
... For the State.

1. The petitioner is a retired Headmaster of a school. He has not been paid his terminal dues because of pendency of a criminal case against him.

2. Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the criminal case is no way related to the service of the petitioner and, accordingly, the terminal benefits ought to be released in his favour.

3. In support of such submission reliance has been placed on the order passed by the Court on 14th November, 2025 in **WPA 2959 of 2024** in **Manik Chandra Sarkar -Versus- The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

4. Reliance has also been placed on the judgment delivered by the Court in the matter of **Gunamay Mahato -Vs- The State of West Bengal & Ors** reported in **2022 4 CHN 381.**

5. Prayer has been made to direct the authority to release his terminal dues.

6. Learned advocate representing the State respondents, on instructions, opposes the prayer of the petitioner.

7. The State respondents rely on the DCRB Scheme, 1981 and submit that as per the Scheme terminal benefits/pension cannot be granted in favour of the petitioner as the criminal proceeding is pending.

8. The complaint relying on which the criminal proceeding was initiated is annexed to the writ petition. The First Information Report dated 12th November, 2022 when the petitioner was in service is also annexed. Charges have been framed under Sections 354/506 IPC. There are two complainants. The complainants are the employees of the school where the petitioner was serving as the Headmaster.

9. On a perusal of the written complaint, the Court is of the prima facie opinion that the offence in question appears to have been committed within the school premises and it cannot be said, at this stage, that the said criminal proceeding does not have any nexus with the service of the employee.

10. There may not have been any pecuniary loss to the institution, but the allegations levelled against the petitioner are such that the Court is not inclined to interfere in the instant writ petition for providing any relief to the petitioner.

11. The writ petition, accordingly, fails and is hereby dismissed.

12. Instruction forwarded by the District Inspector of Schools (S.E), Kolkata dated 31.07.2025 be retained with the records.

13. Urgent Photostat certified copy of this order be supplied to the parties, if applied for, as early as possible.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)