

sk ct.652,
sl 9 to 11

11.7.2025

CPAN 1258 of 2024
Mahadeb Bhattacharya-vs- Manish Jain, Secretary,
School Education Deptt. & Ors.
In
RVW 222 of 2024
(CAN 1/2024, CAN 2/2024)
The D.I. of Schools, S.S.E, Hooghly-vs-Mahadeb Bhattacharya& Ors.
WPA 22118 of 2023
Mahadeb Bhattacharyya-vs-State West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Asim Hati
Ms. Nandini Sharma
Mr. Antariksha Karmakar
...for the petitioner.

Mr. Nilay Baran Mandal
...for the alleged contemnors nos. 4 & 5.

Mr. Bhaskar Prasad Vaisya
Mr. Joydip Banerjee
...for the contemnors.

Mr. Joydip Banerjee
Ms. Mousumi Banerjee
...for the petitioner (In RVW 222 of 2024)

1. Mr. Hati, learned advocate for the petitioner has submitted in Court copy of pension payment order of the petitioner.
2. On the basis of the same, he submits that the commuted value of pension has been denied to the petitioner by the respondent authority while granting pension. He says that the same stands in violation of the finding of this Court in the judgment dated May 9, 2024.
3. Mr. Hati submits that for the reason as above such denial of the commuted value of the pension of the petitioner also amounts to contempt of the Court’s order as above.
4. Noted.

5. Learned advocate for the State has submitted a report of the District Inspector of Schools (S.E.), Hooghly dated July 11, 2025, which is taken on record.
6. According to the same, the pension and gratuity has already been released to the petitioner and the break up has been furnished therewith, as was directed by the Court on the earlier occasion.
7. This report is also taken on record.
8. At this stage, Mr. Banerjee indicates that a review application/RVW 222 of 2024 has been filed by the State/alleged contemnor/respondent in the writ petition, seeking review of the interest portion of the order of this Court dated May 9, 2024. A copy thereof has already been served.
9. Since from the record, it appears that excepting the interest portion to be payable upon the pension amount of the petitioner in terms of the Court's order dated May 9, 2024, the other directions passed vide the said order by this Court have already been complied with by the alleged contemnor, hence, before proceeding further in this contempt application, the Court finds it proper to hear and dispose of the review

application filed by the alleged contemnor/respondent in the writ petition as above.

10. For this the petitioner is granted liberty to file affidavit-in-opposition within a period of two weeks from today. Affidavit-in-reply, if any, may also be filed by the alleged contemnor/respondent in the writ petition/review petition within one week thereafter.
11. Let this matter appear in the list for further consideration after three weeks on the day when this Court sits again.

(Rai Chattopadhyay, J.)