

M/L 244
27.03.2026
Court No.18
SD

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION

WPA 28317 of 2024

Prosenjit Das

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Subrata Mukhopadhyay

Mrs. Basabi Raichoudhury

Ms. Srijata Mukherjee

...for the Petitioner.

Mr. K.J. Yusuf

Mr. Sourav Chowdhury

...for the State.

1. Report of the District Project Officer (ICDS), Dakshin Dinajpur and the exception thereto by the petitioner filed in Court today be retained with the records.

2. The petitioner claims similar relief as granted by this Court vide order dated June 20, 2024 in WPA 23337 of 2023 (***Chaitali Paul vs. The State of West Bengal & Ors.***).

3. Learned advocate for the petitioner submits, upon instruction that, the petitioner is still in service and he is getting the remuneration of Rs.9,110/- per month only.

4. In Chaitali Paul (supra), the Court directed the District Magistrate, Uttar Dinajpur to revise the writ petitioner's remuneration in terms of the Finance Department's Memo No. 9008-F(P) dated September, 2011 which stood revised from time to time and lastly in the year 2024.

5. Learned advocate representing the respondents relies on the report filed by the District Project Officer (ICDS), Dakshin Dinajpur and submits that the benefit of the circular can be provided only if the petitioner is redeployed in service.

6. Upon hearing the parties, it appears that the petitioner is continuing his service on and from June 3, 2009. As the petitioner was never out of employment, the question of redeployment does not arise.

7. The Court in the matter of Chaitali Paul (supra) passed specific order directing enhancement of wages, salary and remuneration in terms of the Finance Department's Memo No. 9008-F(P) dated September 16, 2011. No reason or ground has been put forth in the report differing from the facts of the case of Chaitali Paul (supra). There is no reason as to why the decision passed in the matter of Chaitali Paul (supra) will not cover the petitioner in the instant case.

8. In the matter of Chaitali Paul (supra), the incumbent was serving as Facilitator under the Chopra ICDS Project, Uttar Dinajpur since 2009. In the instant case, the petitioner is serving as a Facilitator under Dakshin Dinajpur. The Court in Chaitali Paul (supra) directed the District Magistrate, Uttar Dinajpur to revise the remuneration. Similar order is passed herein.

9. The District Magistrate, Dakshin Dinajpur is directed to revise the writ petitioner's remuneration in terms of the aforesaid department's memo no. 9008-F(P) dated September 16, 2011 as revised from time to time, lastly in the year 2024.

10. All arrears of payment of the petitioner shall be released within a period of three months from the date of communication of this order.

11. The writ petition stands disposed of.

12. Parties to act on the basis of the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official *website* of this Court.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)