courtkutchehry.com

Company : Sol Infotech Pvt. Ltd.

Website : www.courtkutchehry.com

Printed For :

Date : 24/08/2025

Tapash Chandra Dey Vs The State of West Bengal and Others

Court: Calcutta High Court

Date of Decision: Oct. 18, 2012

Acts Referred: Constitution of India, 1950 â€" Article 226
Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972 â€" Section 8

Hon'ble Judges: Jayanta Kumar Biswas, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Biswadeb Raychowdhury, for the Appellant; Subhendu Sengupta for the State, Mr. Pantu Deb Roy and Mr. Jaladhi Das for CTC, for the Respondent

Judgement

Hon"ble Mr. Justice Jayanta Kumar Biswas

1. The petitioner in this WP under art. 226 dated October 8, 2012 is alleging that for undisclosed reasons the respondents liable to pay him

balance gratuity, etc. and not disputing his entitlement and their liability have not paid the benefits. It is not disputed that the petitioner retired from

services of Calcutta Tramways Company (in short CTC) on February 28, 2010, and that CTC incurred an obligation to pay him balance gratuity,

etc. on March 1, 2010. Nor is it disputed that CTC has not paid him the benefits.

2. Mr. Deb Roy appearing for CTC submits that the petitioner was paid in excess of his entitlement; that the amount payable could not be paid for

acute financial crisis; and that for gratuity the petitioner had a remedy under s. 8 of the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972. He has relied on an

unreported Division Bench decision dated March 27, 2012 in MAT No. 112 of 2012 (The Managing Director, CTC Ltd. & Ors. v. Munshi

Abdul Rouf & Ors.).

3. In my opinion, financial crisis, if any, of CTC is not a ground to say that it was or is entitled to withhold the petitioner"s balance gratuity, etc. It

was under an obligation to pay the benefits on March 1, 2010. By withholding the benefits it has caused irreparable loss and harassment to the

petitioner. This is a litigation it has generated without any valid reason.

4. The plea that for gratuity the petitioner had a remedy under s. 8 of the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972 is without any merit. Availability of a

statutory remedy such as the one under s. 8 of the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972 is not a bar to seek the art. 226 remedy. Besides, the

petitioner"s entitlement to gratuity and liability of CTC to pay gratuity both are undisputed.

5. In my opinion, CTC should be ordered to pay the petitioner all the benefits to which he is entitled. The relied on Division Bench decision does

not entitle CTC to withhold the benefits or pay them in the manner it wishes. It is liable to pay interest. I think interest, if ordered at the rate of 7%

p.a., will be fair and reasonable. For these reasons, I dispose of the WP directing CTC to pay the petitioner balance gratuity, etc. according to law

with interest at the rate of 7% p.a. from March 1, 2010, within four weeks from the date this order is served on it. No costs. Certified xerox.