

M/L 300
22.01.2025
Court No.19
SD

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION

WPA 22056 of 2024

Khagendra Nath Rauth

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Sujit Bhunia
Mr. Debasis Dey
Mrs. Sanchayita De

...for the Petitioner.

Mrs. Rupsha Chakraborty
Ms. Mohuya Dutta Biswas

...for the State.

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

Report as directed by the order dated September
17, 2024 is filed on behalf of the District Inspector of
Schools (PE), Jhargram, the respondent no.3 herein; let it
be kept with the record.

The petitioner was the Assistant Teacher of a
Primary School retired from his service on May 31, 2023.

The petitioner from his pension payment order
had found that a sum of Rs.44,340/- was deducted from
the retiral benefits on the ground of overdrawal in pay and
allowances.

The petitioner by the instant writ petition is
praying refund of the said amount with interest from the
date of his retirement.

There is nothing on record to suggest that the
petitioner was responsible for the payment of such
amount.

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 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. 44,340/- along with interest @8% per annum thereon in favour of the petitioner from the date of issuance of the pension payment order till the date of payment, such payment is to be made within a period of eight weeks from the date of communication of this order.

WPA 22056 of 2024 is disposed of without any order as to costs.

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

(Biswajit Basu, J.)