



**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA**  
[ CIRCUIT BENCH AT PORT BLAIR ]

\*\*\*

**MAT/71/2026**  
**IA No.CAN/1/2026, CAN/2/2026**

The Director of Education

Vs.

Smt B. S.Sangeetha and another

Mr. Rakesh Kumar

Mr. S. Naidu

... for the appellant

Mr. Gopala Binnu Kumar

... for the respondents

April 22, 2026  
[SR]  
Item No.17

1. The scope of present appeal is limited.
2. By the impugned interlocutory order, the writ court, in a challenge preferred by the writ petitioner seeking disbursal of her salary, directed as an interim measure that the respondent-authorities therein shall duly disburse 95% salary of the writ petitioner and the respondent no.1 therein, that is, the Muslim Educational Society School, shall disburse rest 5% of the salary, duly and regularly, to the writ petitioner till the disposal of the writ petition with effect from March, 2025.
3. Learned counsel appearing for the appellant/authority contends that pursuant to an earlier direction of this Court, an enquiry was held against the management of the respondent no.2 herein, namely, the Muslim Educational Society School, which culminated in incriminating findings being arrived at against the respondent no.2.
4. Thus, it is contended that in the event the management of respondent no.2 school is found to have given appointments



illegally, the very premise of the disbursement of the salary to the writ petitioner/respondent no.1 would stand vitiated. In such a scenario, there would be no coverage or security for the present appellant to recover the due amounts from the management of the respondent no.2.

5. Learned counsel for the private respondent no.1 submits that the writ petition has no nexus with the dispute between the school management and the appellant/authorities. As such, since the scope of intervention in the writ petition is limited to the disbursement of salary to the petitioner, there is no scope of interference with the interference with the impugned order at the behest of the appellant.

6. Upon considering the submissions of the parties, we find that the allegations made against the management of the respondent no.2-school by the appellant/authority is on an entirely different footing and of different scope than the remedy sought in the writ petition.

7. The writ petitioner has been working as a teacher in the respondent no.2-school and by the impugned order, the learned Single Judge merely directed disbursement of her salary for the work which she has already done and is still doing.

8. In the event penal measures are taken against the management of the respondent no.2-school by the appellant authority in the final analysis, it will always be open to the appellant to seek recourse to appropriate remedies under the law against the said management.



9. Nothing in the present impugned order affects such rights of the appellant.

10. Thus, we do not find any requirement to interfere with the impugned order.

11. Accordingly, MAT/71/2026 and the connected applications, being CAN/1/2026 and CAN/2/2026, are disposed of in the light of the above observations, without any order as to costs.

12. It is made clear that the observations made above are limited to the disposal of the present appeal and shall not influence in any manner the learned Single Judge taking up the writ petition for final hearing.

**( Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J. )**

**( Smita Das De, J. )**