

**In the High Court at Calcutta  
Circuit Bench at Jalpaiguri  
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction  
Appellate Side**

**The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya  
And  
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Supratim Bhattacharya**

**FMA 54 of 2026**

***With***

**CAN 1 of 2026**

**Raghunath Majumder**

***Vs.***

**The State of West Bengal and Ors.**

|                     |   |                                                           |
|---------------------|---|-----------------------------------------------------------|
| For the petitioners | : | Mr. Soumyajyoti Dutta                                     |
| For the State       | : | Mr. Kunaljeet Bhattacharjee, AGP,<br>Mrs. Rajni Singh Dev |
| Heard on            | : | 19.06.2026                                                |
| Judgment on         | : | 19.06.2026                                                |

**Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.:-**

1. In view of the limited ambit of the appeal, the same is admitted and taken up for hearing.
2. Learned counsel for the appellant submits that by the impugned order, the learned Single Judge directed compliance of an order passed by the District Inspector of Schools (SE), Jalpaiguri, directing the Headmaster of the High School where the petitioner served as a librarian to recast the service book of the appellant/petitioner for rectification of basic pay in respect of the appellant/petitioner as per extant rules. Although the

date of the concerned memorandum has been erroneously mentioned in the impugned order as September 11, 2025, it transpires from the annexure at page 104 of CAN1 of 2026 that the actual memorandum is Memo No. 913 dated April 11, 2025.

3. Learned Additional Government Pleader (AGP), appearing on behalf of the respondents/ State, submits that the intention of the impugned memorandum was to rectify certain discrepancies regarding the last-drawn pay of the appellant.
4. However, upon hearing learned counsel for the parties, it transpires that the impugned memorandum does not merely restrict itself to the rectification regarding last-drawn pay but directs the service book of the appellant itself to be recast for “rectification of basic pay” which was not permissible after the appellant demitted service, in view of no issue having been raised regarding such basic pay during the entire tenure of the appellant’s service.
5. Accordingly, FMA 54 of 2026 is allowed on contest, thereby setting aside the impugned Order dated February 25, 2026 passed in WPA 272 of 2026 as well as Memo No. 913 dated April 11, 2025. Any action taken pursuant to the said order or the impugned memorandum, bearing Memo No. 913 dated April 11, 2025, hereby stands rescinded and quashed.
6. The respondent-authorities are directed to ensure that the PPO (Pension Payment Order) of the appellant is prepared at the earliest on the basis of his service book and pension be commenced to be disbursed in favour of the appellant.

7. Since we are informed by the respondents that a provisional amount of pension was already directed to be paid, the payments to be commenced now shall be adjusted with the amount already paid.
8. It is further clarified that in the event the appellant has any grievance as to the final PPO which shall be prepared pursuant to this judgment, it will be open to the appellant to challenge the same by taking recourse to appropriate remedy in law.
9. We hasten to add that in the event the respondents require some clarification from the appellant while preparing such PPO, the respondents shall intimate the appellant regarding the same and give an opportunity to the appellant to clarify such doubt, if necessary by producing necessary documents.
10. CAN 1 of 2026 is also consequentially disposed of.
11. No order as to costs.
12. Urgent certified copies of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of requisite formalities.

**(Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.)**

I agree.

**(Supratim Bhattacharya, J.)**

JPD-6  
Ct No.07  
19.06.2026  
(SSS)