

Mr. R. Islam, learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the main grievance of the writ petitioner is with the recovery that is being made at Rs. 10,300/- (Rupees Ten Thousand Three Hundred only) per month, from his monthly salary. The said deduction according to the learned counsel is impermissible, inasmuch as, the same is for recovery of the amount of Rs. 3,59,600/- (Three Lakhs Fifty Nine Thousand Six Hundred only), which had been granted to another Teacher, namely; Gayetri Paul (Das), who has since retired. He therefore, prays that in the interim, some protection be given to the writ petitioner.

Mr. N.D. Chullai, learned AAG assisted by Ms. Z.E. Nongkynrih, learned GA for the respondents Nos. 1 to 4, in reply has submitted that the deduction is as per the directions of this Court, passed in WA No. 37 of 2014, wherein this Court had allowed the recovery of the amounts from the Institutions or Managing Committees.

Be that as it may, at this stage a prima facie case has been made out for grant of interim orders. Accordingly, until further orders, there shall be no further deduction of the amount Rs. 10,300/- (Rupees Ten Thousand Three Hundred only), from the salary of the petitioner.

List this matter on 31.07.2024.

JUDGE

Meghalaya
09.07.2024

“V. Lyndem-PS”