

WPA 20301 of 2024

**Provash Paul
versus
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Atindranath Misra

...For the respondent nos. 7 and 8

Mr. Sirjan Nayak

Ms. Rituparna Maitra

...For the State

Mr. P.K.Roy

Mr. Ankit Sureka

Mr. Biplab Das

...For the respondent nos. 2,3,4 & 6

1. Learned advocate appearing for the respondent nos. 7 and 8 would submit that though the petitioner was employed for a fixed tenure and at the end of the tenure, the petitioner's services being no longer required, the petitioner has been discharged from his duties. At present the respondent no. 7 does not require any additional man power.

2. Though the petitioner is not represented, however, having heard the learned advocates appearing for the respondent nos. 7 and 8 and noting that the respondent no. 7 at present does not require any additional manpower, I am of the view that in the event the respondent no. 7 employs any person in the post where the petitioner had been working, first preference must be given to the petitioner having regard to his past experience and his age should not stand as a bar for his re-employment.

3. With the above direction and observation, the writ petition is disposed of.

4. All parties shall act on the basis of the server copy of this order duly downloaded from this Court's official website.

(Raja Basu Chowdhury, J.)