

05. 05.02.2026
Court No.2
(Tanmoy)

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
(APPELLATE SIDE)**

WPA/29016/2025

**ARIJIT CHATTERJEE
VS
THE BRIDGE AND ROOF CO. (INDIA) LIMITED & ORS.**

Mr. Ujjal Ray, Adv.
Mr. Atreya Chakraborty, Adv.

...for the petitioner.

Mr. Mr. Rohit Banerjee, Adv.
Ms. Ditsha Dhar, Adv.
Ms. Debanjana Paul, Adv.

...for the respondents.

1. Matter is heard in presence of learned Advocates representing the petitioner and the respondents.
2. By presenting this writ petition challenge has been thrown to the charge-sheet dated 10th October, 2025 which was issued against the petitioner. It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the impugned charge-sheet does not contain list of witnesses who are to depose during course of enquiry before the Inquiry Officer and on that score said charge-sheet cannot survive.
3. On the contrary, learned Advocate representing the respondent Authorities has submitted that it is spelt out specifically while issuing charge-sheet that department is not going to produce witness in order to substantiate charges levelled against the petitioner as

a result whereof in the document which is enclosed to the charge-sheet dated 10th October, 2025, page 105 of the writ petition, it is indicated 'NIL'. It is further contended on behalf of the respondent Authorities that 'NIL' denotes no witness shall be produced during enquiry on behalf of the department to depose against the petitioner.

4. In view of aforesaid submissions made on behalf of the respondent Authorities Court is unable to accept the contention made on behalf of the petitioner that the charge-sheet dated 10th October, 2025 may not survive due to failure on the part of the disciplinary authority to supply names of witnesses. Charge-sheet can only be interfered with if same is without jurisdiction or *mala fide*. No such case is made out in the writ petition.
5. Hence at this stage Court declines to interfere with the proceeding initiated against the petitioner.
6. It is further submitted on behalf of the respondent Authorities that on all three previous occasions in spite of fixing dates by the Inquiry Officer petitioner did not participate in the enquiry.
7. As petitioner has retired on superannuation on 31st December, 2025, Court directs the concerned respondent Authority being the disciplinary authority to conclude the disciplinary proceeding expeditiously but not later than six months from date. During

course of enquiry unnecessary adjournment shall not be granted except for the reasons which are beyond the control of the petitioner.

8. With the aforesaid directions writ petition stands disposed of.
9. It is apprised by the learned Advocate representing the respondent Authorities that a writ petition being WPA/23465/2025 is filed by the petitioner questioning the suspension order. It is submitted that as the petitioner has retired on superannuation on 31st December, 2025, the said writ petition becomes infructuous.
10. List the writ petition being WPA/23465/2025 under the heading "To Be Mentioned" on 12th February, 2026.
11. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be made available to the parties upon usual undertakings.

(SAUGATA BHATTACHARYYA, J.)