

10.02.2026
13 & 14
sdas

WPA 919 of 2025

Oindrilla Hazra Pratapan
Vs.
Satyajit Ray Film & Television Institute (SRFTI) &
Ors.

With

WPA 2457 of 2026

Oindrilla Hazra Pratapan
Vs.
Satyajit Ray Film & Television Institute (SRFTI) &
Ors.

Mr. Soumya Majumder, Sr. Adv.
Mr. Debashis Banerjee
Mr. Sumitava Chakraborty
Ms. Bratati Pramanick
..... for the petitioner
(in both matters)

Mr. Dwijadas Chakraborty
Mr. Sukanta Ghosh
..... for the respondents no. 1 & 2
(in WPA 919 of 2025)

Mr. Sukanta Ghosh
..... for the respondents no. 1 & 2
(in WPA 2457 of 2026)

Mr. Lokenath Chatterjee
Ms. Mary Datta
..... for the respondents no. 3 & 4
(in both matters)

In Re : WPA 919 of 2025

1. The petitioner is an Associate Professor with the respondent no. 1, the institute. She has been serving as such since more than a decade.

2. The petitioner's service was suspended on the basis of the complaints made by certain students that the petitioner indulged in harassing acts relating to needless banter on account of her personal bias and prejudice ranging from skin colour to various other issues.
3. This suspension was challenged by the petitioner before this Hon'ble Court by way of WPA 919 of 2025.
4. The said writ petition was taken up and heard and an interim order was passed by this Hon'ble Court on January 15, 2025, which is presently subsisting.
5. The aforesaid interim order has not been challenged and has attained its finality.
6. Since the suspension has been stayed, the petitioner has been and is at liberty to attend the classes, provided the institute allots necessary work to her to take such classes.
7. The efficacy of this writ petition has served its purpose.

In Re : WPA 2457 of 2026

8. This is the second writ petition filed by the petitioner, this time challenging the mode and manner in which the proceedings have been carried on against the petitioner. Principally that the enquiry started some time in 2024 and

presently on the basis of the memorandum of charges framed on May 28, 2025, has been unnecessarily prolonged. This prolongation of the proceedings is harassing for the petitioner.

9. Mr. Chakraborty, learned Advocate appearing for the respondents no. 1 and 2 and Mr. Chatterjee, learned Advocate appearing for the respondents no. 3 and 4 conjointly submit that the proceedings, though somewhat lethargic, is near conclusion with another ten witnesses left to be concluded.
10. The petitioner cannot evade the process of enquiry and the follow up thereof as enshrined in the Acts and Rules pertaining to this institute. In fact, the petitioner is not seeking to evade the same. The petitioner's prayer in the second writ petition is a fair action that the proceedings be completed within a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner.
11. The parties are *ad idem* that some more time will be required to conclude the proceedings as it entails not just the witness action but also filing of a report thereof by the Inquiry Authority.
12. In view of the aforestated, it would be trite to direct the respondent no. 4, the Inquiry Authority, to complete the process and file its report by May 15, 2026.

13. Since the petitioner has enjoyed the order of stay of the suspension for over one year in WPA 919 of 2025, it would only be the fitness of affairs that the stay order is extended. The suspension of the petitioner is stayed till June 22, 2026. The petitioner will continue taking classes, as allotted by the respondent no. 1, the institute.
14. With the aforestated directions, both writ petitions being WPA 919 of 2025 and WPA 2457 of 2026 are disposed of.
15. There shall, however, be no order as to costs.
16. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties on usual undertaking.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)