

06.03.2026.

PB

Sl. No.37.

Ct. No.652.

WPCRC 147 of 2025

In

WPA 12237 of 2008

Gayatri Ganguly (Bhattacharya)

Vs.

Mr. Sunny Mishra

Mr. K. M. Hossain,
Ms. Keya Sutradhar,
Mr. Kazi A. Ali,
Mr. Mayukh Saha.

... For the Petitioner.

As per report of the District Inspector of Schools (S.E.), South 24 Parganas dated September 18, 2025, he has issued order granting honours graduate scale of pay in favour of the petitioner with effect from May 1, 2000 to September 30, 2002, and the post-graduate scale of pay to him with effect from the subsequent day of the last date of the petitioner's Part-II Examination, that is from October 1, 2002, till the date of his retirement.

Also according to the said report, the District Inspector of Schools (S.E.), South 24 Parganas has sent the pension file of the petitioner to the Director of Pension, Provident Fund and Group Insurance, Government of West Bengal for issuance of revised Pension Payment Order (PPO) in favour of the

petitioner, for arrear payment as well as revised pension.

Mr. Hossain, learned advocate for the petitioner submits as regards arrear salary in particular, that for disbursement of the same, no sanction of DPPG is necessary and the same is within the authority and power of the District Inspector of Schools (S.E.), South 24 Parganas/the alleged contemnor. He alleges that in spite of specific direction of this Court in the order dated March 18, 2025 and in spite of issuance of order by himself consequent thereto, the alleged contemnor has not yet disbursed any arrear salary in favour of the petitioner.

So far as issuance of the revised Pension Payment Order incorporating the benefits as above in favour of the petitioner is concerned, it has not yet been issued by the respective department/DPPG and arrear pension in terms thereof has not yet been granted to the petitioner.

Unfortunately, in spite of the matter being with regard to payment of appropriate pension to a retired school teacher, the alleged contemnor does not consider the same worth enough significance, importance and attention as he chooses not to be represented in Court today.

In these circumstances, the Court is compelled to issue Rule against the alleged contemnor directing him to explain in writing being personally present in

Court as to why the order of the Court dated March 18, 2025, has not yet been complied with and show cause as to why the Rule, as above, shall not be made absolute, due to such willful and deliberate violation of the Court's order as above.

Let the Rule be made returnable on March 13, 2026.

Petitioner shall deposit the special messenger cost, at once.

(Rai Chattopadhyay, J.)

**Rule drawn in
separate sheet**