

27th March, 2026
(D/L No.2)
Ct. No.4
(SKB)

CPAN 798 of 2025
In
W.P.S.T.15 of 2025

Lipika Pal
Versus
Dr. Siddhartha Niyogi and others

Ms. Pampa Dey (Dhabal),
Mr. Biswarup Chatterjee,
Ms. Sangita Banerjee
....for the applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Tapan Kumar Mukherjee, Id. AGP,
Mr. Somnath Naskar
... for the alleged contemnors.

1. Heard the learned advocate for the applicant/petitioner as well as the learned AGP.
2. This court found deprivation of salary of the applicant to be unsustainable as it was not preceded by any proceeding.
3. Before the writ court, the State took a ground that in view of the applicant's unauthorized absence, the salary was withheld, which we deprecated. We directed for payment of the admissible dues and the month-to-month salary in accordance with law.
4. Alleging violation of the court's order, the present application is filed.

5. The compliance report is filed by the State, after service on the petitioner's advocate, which shows payment of certain amounts made by an order dated 23.03.2026 issued by the Block Medical Officer of Health, Bishnupur-I Block, South 24 Parganas. The same also reveals that the applicant/petitioner has joined the duty by a joining report dated 26.02.2026.
6. The learned advocate for the applicant/petitioner, however, submits that the amounts paid are in violation of the court's order as it is not the admissible amount. She alleges that the applicant/petitioner worked for more days, which can be verified from the attendance register. The payment for the entire admissible dues, therefore, has not been made in terms of the court's order.
7. We find that the direction of the court in the writ petition was to pay the admissible dues, which the compliance report shows to be done. We, however, do not propose to go into the issue whether these are the total dues of the applicant/petitioner or whether she would be entitled for anything else. If there is a claim based on an attendance register, which is required to be asserted, it is for the

applicant/petitioner to take steps in accordance with law in an appropriate proceeding under the appropriate jurisdiction.

8. Having regard to the compliance report showing payment of admissible dues, we find no reason to proceed further in the contempt jurisdiction.
9. Without expressing any opinion on the applicant's/petitioner's claim, we leave it to the applicant/petitioner to avail remedies in accordance with law.
10. The contempt application is, thus, disposed of in terms of the above.

(Madhuresh Prasad, J.)

(Supratim Bhattacharya, J.)