

O/C



REGISTERED POST WITH A/D.  
HAND DELIVERY  
AFFIXATION ON PROPERTY

ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA  
(erstwhile KOLKATA PORT TRUST)

(Appointed by the Central Govt. Under Section 3 of Act 40 of 1971-Central Act)  
Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorized Occupant) Act 1971  
OFFICE OF THE ESTATE OFFICER  
6, Fairley Place (1st Floor)  
KOLKATA - 700 001  
\*\*\*\*\*

Court Room At the 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
of Kolkata Port Trust's  
Fairley Warehouse  
6, Fairley Place, Kolkata- 700 001.

REASONED ORDER NO. 28 DT 26.06.2013  
PROCEEDINGS NO.1234 OF 2011

SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA  
(ERSTWHILE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE PORT OF KOLKATA)  
-Vs-  
The Labour Commissioner, West Bengal (O.P)

F O R M - "B"

ORDER UNDER SUB-SECTION (1) OF SECTION 5 OF THE PUBLIC  
PREMISES (EVICTION OF UNAUTHORISED OCCUPANTS) ACT, 1971

WHEREAS I, the undersigned, am satisfied, for the reasons recorded below that  
**The Labour Commissioner, West Bengal, New Secretariat Buildings, 1 No. Kiran Shankar Roy Road(11<sup>th</sup> Floor), Kolkata-700001** is in unauthorized occupation of the Public Premises specified in the Schedule below:

REASONS

1. That the proceedings against O.P. is very much maintainable.
2. That the lease as granted to O.P. by SMPK had doubtlessly determined by efflux of time, in the facts and circumstances of the case.
3. That O.P. has erected unauthorised constructions on the subject public premises in question without having any authority of law.
4. That O.P. cannot claim "renewal of lease" as a matter of right, particularly when the lease in question does not contain any provision for exercising any option for renewal.
5. That O.P. has failed to bear any witness or adduce any evidence in support of their occupation as "authorised occupation" inspite of repeated chances for a considerable period and O.P's act of continuing in occupation in the Public Premises without paying requisite charges is opposed to public policy.
6. That notice to quit dated 03.03.2010 issued by the Port Authority to O.P., demanding possession is valid, lawful and binding upon the parties.
7. That O.P's occupation has become unauthorized in view of Sec. 2(g) of the P.P. Act and O.P. is liable to pay damages for unauthorized use and enjoyment of the Port Property right from the date of expiry of the lease period on and from 04.09.1993 in question upto the date of handing over of clear, vacant and unencumbered possession to the Port Authority.

By Order of:  
THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
CERTIFIED COPY OF THE ORDER  
PASSED BY THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
Head Assistant  
26/6/2013  
OFFICE OF THE LD. ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT

5207

PLEASE SEE ON REVERSE



(2)

A copy of the reasoned order No. 28 dated 06.06.2023 is attached hereto which also forms a part of the reasons.

NOW, THEREFORE, in exercise of the powers conferred on me under Sub-Section (1) of Section 5 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorized Occupants) Act, 1971, I hereby order the said **The Labour Commissioner, West Bengal, New Secretariat Buildings, 1 No. Kiran Shankar Roy Road(11<sup>th</sup> Floor), Kolkata-700001** and all persons who may be in occupation of the said premises or any part thereof to vacate the said premises within 15 days of the date of publication of this order. In the event of refusal or failure to comply with this order within the period specified above the said **The Labour Commissioner, West Bengal, New Secretariat Buildings, 1 No. Kiran Shankar Roy Road(11<sup>th</sup> Floor), Kolkata-700001** and all other persons concerned are liable to be evicted from the said premises, if need be, by the use of such force as may be necessary.

#### SCHEDULE

##### Plate Nos. D-376

The said piece or parcel of land msg.2840.694 Sq.m at Taratala Police Station, Calcutta, District, District-24 Parganas(South), Registration District-Alipore. It is bounded on the North by the Trustees' Taratala Road, on the East by the Trustees' Road of Taratala Road of Taratala Staff Colony connecting Taratala Road on the South by the Trustees' open space and then road of Taratala Staff Colony, on the West by the Trustees' Road of Taratala Staff Colony connecting Taratala Road. Trustees' means the Board of Syama Prasad Mookerjee Port, Kolkata Authority (Erstwhile Board of Trustees' for the Port of Kolkata).

Dated: 06.07.2023,

  
Signature & Seal of  
Estate Officer.

By Order of:  
THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
CERTIFIED COPY OF THE ORDER  
PASSED BY THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
Head Assistant  
OFFICE OF THE LD. ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT

COPY FORWARDED TO THE ESTATE MANAGER, SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA FOR INFORMATION.



**Estate Officer, SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA**

Appointed by the Central Govt. Under Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants ) Act 1971

Proceeding No. 1234, 1234/D of 2011 Order Sheet No. 25

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA**

**VS**

**THE LABOUR COMMISSIONER WEST BENGAL**

**FINAL ORDER**

The instant proceedings No. 1234, 1234/D of 2011 arises out of the application bearing No. Lnd. 4473/II/10/2641 dated 05.10.2010 filed by Syama Prasad Mookerjee Port, Kolkata (Erstwhile Kolkata Port Trust/KoPT), hereinafter referred to as "SMPK", the Applicant herein, praying for order of eviction and recovery of arrear compensation along with interest against **The Labour Commissioner, West Bengal**, O.P. herein, under relevant provision of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act 1971. The facts of the case is summarised here under.

SMPK had granted a long term lease of land measuring 2840.694sq.m situated at Taratala Road, Thana-Taratala Police Station, Dist. 24 Parganas(South) under Occupation No.D-376 to the O.P. under a long term lease of 30 years w.e.f. 04.09.1963. The said lease had expired on 03.09.1993 due to efflux of time.

It is submitted by SMPK that O.P. had erected unauthorised construction on the demised land in gross violation of the terms of tenancy as granted to O.P. and O.P. continued to occupy the Port premises unauthorisedly beyond the expiry of the lease period.

In view of the aforesaid breaches committed by the O.P., SMPK had issued notice to quit being No. Lnd. 4473/II/10/4888 dated 03.03.2010 followed by subsequent reminder being No.Lnd.4473/II/1023 dated 24.06.2010 asking the O.P. to hand over clear, vacant, peaceful and unencumbered possession of the property to SMPK on 19.07.2010. SMPK submits that O.P. has no authority under law to occupy the public premises after expiry of the lease period and was required to hand over the possession of the property in question to SMPK on 19.07.2010 as required under the said reminder notice.

It is the case of SMPK that O.P. is in wrongful occupation in the public premises on and from 04.09.1993 and is liable to pay compensation charges/mesne profits for

28

26.06.2023

By Order of :  
THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
CERTIFIED COPY OF THE ORDER  
PASSED BY THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
Head Assistant  
OFFICE OF THE LD. ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT



# Estate Officer, SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA

Appointed by the Central Govt. Under Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act 1971

1234, 1234/D or 2011 Order Sheet No. 26

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA

VS

THE LABOUR COMMISSIONER WEST BENGAL

28  
26.06.2023

unauthorized use and occupation of the Port Property in question.

Notice/s u/s 4 and 7 of the Act both dated 08.11.2012(vide Order No.6 dated 08.11.2012) were issued by this Forum to O.P. to show cause why an order of eviction and an order requiring O.P. to pay arrears of damages/compensation charges together with interest should not be made against the O.P.

O.P. contested the matter through its authorized representative and filed on 11.12.2012 its initial reply/written objection to the Show Cause notice/s along with the authorization letter, duly signed by A. Roychowdhury. It appears from record that during the course of hearing from time to time some directions were passed by the Forum for payment of occupational charges by O.P. However, without complying such order, O.P. prayed for an administrative reconciliation of the instant matter before the appropriate authority of SMPK. Further, O.P had also claimed about filing of their effective reply dated 14.12.2012 however, finding no copy of such reply in the record, following the principles of Natural Justice, I proceed to consider the case made out by O.P. through its applications dated 11.12.2012.

The main contentions of O.P. can be summarized as follows:-

- 1) It is not clear to what extent the Labour Commissioner was/is involved with the matter as the Original signed copy of the lease agreement as mentioned in the SMPK's application is not available with the Office of Labour Commissioner.
- 2) The West Bengal Labour Welfare Board has been occupying and using the said land of SMPK and Labour Commissioner is no way related with that property of SMPK.
- 3) The Labour Commissioner knows nothing about construction work said to have been carried out within the said premises of SMPK.

By Order of:  
THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
CERTIFIED COPY OF THE ORDER  
PASSED BY THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
8-6/9-23  
Head Assistant  
OFFICE OF THE LD. ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT



**Estate Officer, SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA**

Appointed by the Central Govt. Under Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act 1971

Proceeding No. 1234, 1234/D of 2011 Order Sheet No. 27

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA**

**VS**

**THE LABOUR COMMISSIONER WEST BENGAL**

28

26.06.2023

- 4) The West Bengal Labour Welfare Board is the appropriate party in the instant matter.
- 5) The Lease may be extended for a further period of 30 years or more allowing the Labour Department to occupy and use the said land of SMPK and the compensation claimed by SMPK may be waived in the interest of workers.

Referring to the above contentions, The Labour Commissioner, West Bengal/O.P. has prayed for an appropriate order from the Forum.

Now, while passing the Final Order, after carefully considered the documents on record and the submissions of the parties, I find that following issues have come up for my adjudication:

- I) Whether the instant proceedings against the O.P. is maintainable or not;
- II) Whether O.P. committed the breaches as claimed for by SMPK, or not;
- III) Whether O.P. can claim for "renewal of lease" in respect of the Public Premises in question as a matter of right or not;
- IV) Whether SMPK's notice dated 03.03.2010 as issued to O.P., demanding possession from O.P. is valid and lawful or not;
- V) Whether O.P.'s occupation could be termed as "unauthorised occupation" in view of Sec.2 (g) of the P.P. Act and O.P. is liable to pay damages to SMPK during the period of its unauthorised occupation or not;

Regarding the **Issue No.I**, I must say that the properties owned and controlled by the Port Authority has been declared as "public premises" by the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 and Section-15 of the Act puts a complete bar on Court's

By Order of:  
THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
CERTIFIED COPY OF THE ORDER  
PASSED BY THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
Head Assistant  
OFFICE OF THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
26/6/23



**Estate Officer, SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA**

Appointed by the Central Govt. Under Section 3 of the Public Premises  
(Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act 1971

Proceedings No. 1234, 1234/D of 2011 Order Sheet No. 28

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA**

**VS**

**THE LABOUR COMMISSIONER WEST BENGAL**

28  
26.06.2023

jurisdiction to entertain any matter relating to eviction of unauthorized occupants from the public premises and recovery of rental dues and/or damages, etc. SMPK has come up with an application for declaration of O.P.'s status as unauthorized occupant in to the public premises with the prayer for order of eviction, recovery of compensation etc on the ground of expiry of lease as earlier granted to O.P. in respect of the premises in question. So long the property of the Port Authority is coming under the purview of "public premises" as defined under the Act, adjudication process by serving Show Cause Notice/s u/s 4 & 7 of the Act is very much maintainable and there cannot be any question about the maintainability of proceedings before this Forum of Law. In fact, proceedings before this Forum of Law is not statutorily barred unless there is any specific order of stay of such proceedings by any competent court of law.

As regards the **issue No. II**, I must mention that once the lease is accepted to have expired in all sense of law, the occupation of the O.P. is definitely "unauthorised" in terms of Sec. 2 (g) of the P.P. Act, 1971 and as such any discussion as to existence of any other breaches are purely academic. Hence, I have not gone into the merit of SMPK's allegations regarding carrying out of unauthorized construction against O.P. Moreover, it is also seen from the record that their no rental dues at present. O.P. is only liable to pay compensation charges for unauthorised use and occupation of the subject premises in question.

On **issue No. III**, there is no scope to extend the matter by elaborate discussion. The lease in question expired on 03.09.1993 and there was no provision in the expired lease for exercising any option for renewal of the same. In absence of any "renewal clause" that is to say any provision for exercising option for renewal by O.P., I do not find any scope to consider any matter of "renewal of lease" in favour of O.P. In fact O.P. cannot claim "renewal of lease" in question as a matter of right. It is worthy to

By Order of:  
THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
CERTIFIED COPY OF THE ORDER  
PASSED BY THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
8/6/23  
Head Assistant  
OFFICE OF THE LD. ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT



# Estate Officer, SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA

Appointed by the Central Govt. Under Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act 1971

Proceedings No. 1234, 1234D of 2011 Order Sheet No. 29

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA**

**VS**

**THE LABOUR COMMISSIONER WEST BENGAL**

mention here that though it is the contention of O.P. that it is not clear to them as to what extent they are involved with the matter but still prays for extension of lease for 30 years. It is therefore clear from the contentions of O.P. they are well in occupation of the premises and such statement made by them are not correct. Hence the issue is decided against O.P.

**Issues No.IV& V** are taken up together as they are related with each other, I must say that a lessee like O.P. cannot claim any legal right to hold the property after expiry of the period of lease. O.P has failed to satisfy this Forum about any consent on the part of SMPK in occupying the public premises. I am consciously of the view that SMPK never recognized O.P. as a lawful user/tenant in respect of the property in question after expiry of the period of such long term lease. As per Section 2 (g) of the P.P. Act the "unauthorized occupation", in relation to any Public Premises, means the occupation by any person of the public premises without authority for such occupation and includes the continuance in occupation by any person in the public premises after the authority (whether by way of grant or any other mode of transfer) under which he was allowed to occupy the premises has expired or has been determined for any reason whatsoever. Further, as per the Transfer of Property Act, a lease of immovable property determines either by efflux of time limited thereby or by implied surrender or on expiration of notice to determine the lease or to quit or of intention to quit, the property leased, duly given by one party to another. It is also a settled question of law that O.P, occupier cannot claim any legal right to hold the property after expiry of the lease, without any valid grant or allotment from SMPK's side. Moreover, as per the Transfer of Property Act, 1882, a lessee is under legal obligation to hand over possession of the property to its landlord/lessor in its original condition after expiration of tenancy under lease. The tenancy of the O.P. automatically stands terminated

By Order of:  
THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
CERTIFIED COPY OF THE ORDER  
PASSED BY THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
Head Assistant  
OFFICE OF THE LD. ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
26/7/23

*[Handwritten signature]*

*[Handwritten signature]*



**Estate Officer, SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA**

Appointed by the Central Govt. Under Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act 1971

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA**

**VS**

**THE LABOUR COMMISSIONER WEST BENGAL**

28  
26.06.2023

upon expiry of the lease-hold period and no additional Notice is required in the eye of law on the part of the landlord to ask the O.P. to vacate the premises. In other words, in case of a long term lease having a specific date of expiration, there is no legal compulsion upon the landlord to issue any Notice to Quit. The landlord is, however, free to issue such a Notice as a reminder or as an act of gratuity. In the instant case, the landlord i.e. SMPK adopted such a course and claims to have issued a Notice to O.P. dated 03.03.2010 followed by a reminder notice dated 24.06.2010 asking for vacation of the said premises on 19.07.2010. Whether such Notice has been received by O.P. or not is quite immaterial inasmuch as O.P. was duty bound to hand over possession to SMPK after expiry of such lease which it had failed to do so. Therefore, O.P's occupation is unauthorized.

"Damages" are like "mesne profit" that is to say the profit arising out of wrongful use and occupation of the property in question. I have no hesitation in mind to say that after expiry of the lease, O.P. has lost its authority to occupy the public premises and O.P. is liable to pay damages for such unauthorized use and occupation.

To come into such conclusion, I am fortified by the decision/observation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Civil Appeal No.7988 of 2004, decided on 10<sup>th</sup> December 2004, reported (2005)1 SCC 705, para-11 of the said judgment reads as follows.

Para:11-" under the general law, and in cases where the tenancy is governed only by the provisions of the Transfer of Property Act 1882, once the tenancy comes to an end by determination of lease u/s.111 of the Transfer of Property Act, the right of the tenant to continue in possession of the premises comes to an end and for any period thereafter, for which he continues to occupy the premises, he becomes liable to pay damages for use and occupation at the rate at which the landlord would have let out the premises on

By Order of:  
THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
CERTIFIED COPY OF THE ORDER  
PASSED BY THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
26/7/23  
Head Assistant  
OFFICE OF THE LD. ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT





**Estate Officer, SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA**

Appointed by the Central Govt. Under Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act 1971

Proceedings No. 1234, 1234/D of 2011 Order Sheet No. 31

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA**

**VS**

**THE LABOUR COMMISSIONER WEST BENGAL**

28

26.06.2023

*being vacated by the tenant. ....*

The Port Authority has a definite legitimate claim to get its revenue involved into this matter as per the SMPK's Schedule of Rent Charges for the relevant period and O.P. cannot claim continuance of its occupation as "authorized occupation" without making payment of requisite charges. I am fortified by the Apex Court judgment reported in JT 2006 (4) Sc 277 (Sarup Singh Gupta -vs- Jagdish Singh &Ors.) wherein it has been clearly observed that in the event of termination of lease the practice followed by Courts is to permit landlord to receive each month by way of compensation for use and occupation of the premises, an amount equal to the monthly rent payable by the tenant. In my view, the case in hand is very much relevant for the purpose of determination of damages upon the guiding principle as laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the above case. In course of hearing, it is submitted on behalf of SMPK that the charges claimed on account of damages is on the basis of the SMPK's Schedule of Rent Charges as applicable for all the tenants/occupiers of the premises in a similarly placed situation and such Schedule of Rent Charges is notified rates of charges under provisions of the Major Port Trusts Act 1963. In my view, such claim of charges for damages by SMPK is based on sound reasoning and should be acceptable by this Forum of Law. As per law, when a contract has been expired by efflux of time and party continues their occupation unauthorisedly, the another party who suffers by such violation is entitled to receive, from the party who has violated the terms of the contract, compensation for any loss or damage caused to him thereby, which naturally arose in the usual course of things from such violation of the terms, or which the parties knew, when they made the contract to be likely to result from the such violation.

By Order of:  
THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
CERTIFIED COPY OF THE ORDER  
PASSED BY THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
Head Assistant  
OFFICE OF THE LD. ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
6/7/23

*[Handwritten signature]*

*[Handwritten signature]*



# Estate Officer, SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA

Appointed by the Central Govt. Under Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act 1971

Proceedings No. 1234, 1234/D of 2011 Order Sheet No. 32

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA**

**VS**

**THE LABOUR COMMISSIONER WEST BENGAL**

28  
26.06.2023

O.P. failed to substantiate as to how its occupation could be termed as "authorised" in view of Sec. 2(g) of the P.P Act, after expiry of the period as mentioned in the SMPK's notice dated 03.03.2010, demanding possession from O.P. I have no hesitation to observe that O.P.'s act in continuing occupation after expiry of the lease is unauthorized and O.P. is liable to pay damages for unauthorized use and occupation of the Port property in question upto the date of delivering vacant, unencumbered and peaceful possession to SMPK.

NOW THEREFORE, the logical conclusion which could be arrived at that O.P.'s occupation and the occupation of anybody asserting any right through O.P. have become unauthorized and they are liable to be evicted u/s.5 of the Act on the following grounds/reasons.

1. That the proceedings against O.P. is very much maintainable.
2. That the lease as granted to O.P. by SMPK had doubtlessly determined by efflux of time, in the facts and circumstances of the case.
3. That O.P. has erected unauthorised constructions on the subject public premises in question without having any authority of law.
4. That O.P. cannot claim "renewal of lease" as a matter of right, particularly when the lease in question does not contain any provision for exercising any option for renewal.
5. That O.P. has failed to bear any witness or adduce any evidence in support of their occupation as "authorised occupation" inspite of repeated chances for a considerable period and O.P.'s act of continuing in occupation in the Public Premises without paying requisite charges is opposed to public policy.

By Order of:  
THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
CERTIFIED COPY OF THE ORDER  
PASSED BY THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
26/6/23  
Head Assistant  
OFFICE OF THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT

*[Handwritten signature]*

*[Handwritten signature]*



# Estate Officer, SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA

Appointed by the Central Govt. Under Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act 1971

Proceedings No. 1234, 1234/D of 2011 Order Sheet No. 33  
**BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA**

**VS**  
**THE LABOUR COMMISSIONER WEST BENGAL**

28

26.06.2023

6. That notice to quit dated 03.03.2010 issued by the Port Authority to O.P., demanding possession is valid, lawful and binding upon the parties.
7. That O.P's occupation has become unauthorized in view of Sec. 2(g) of the P.P. Act and O.P. is liable to pay damages for unauthorized use and enjoyment of the Port Property right from the date of expiry of the lease period on and from 04.09.1993 in question upto the date of handing over of clear, vacant and unencumbered possession to the Port Authority.

ACCORDINGLY, I sign the formal order of eviction u/s 5 of the Act as per Rule made there under, giving 15 days time to O.P. and any person/s whoever may be in occupation to vacate the premises. I make it clear that all person/s whoever may be in occupation are liable to be evicted by this order and the Port Authority is entitled to claim damages for unauthorized use and enjoyment of the property against O.P. in accordance with Law up to the date of recovery of possession of the same. SMPK is directed to submit a comprehensive status report of the Public Premises in question on inspection of the property after expiry of the 15 days as aforesaid so that necessary action could be taken for execution of the order of eviction u/s. 5 of the Act as per Rule made under the Act.

It is my considered view that a sum of Rs.95,37,233.14(Rupees Ninety five lakh thirty seven thousand two hundred thirty three and paise fourteen only) for the period from 04.09.1993 to 30.09.2010 (both days inclusive) is due and recoverable from O.P. by the Port authority on account of damages and O.P. must have to pay such dues to SMPK on or before 11.07.2023 The said damages shall attract compound interest @ 7.50 % per annum, which is the current rate of interest as per the Interest Act, 1978 (as gathered by me from the official website of the State Bank of India) from the date of

By Order of :  
THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
CERTIFIED COPY OF THE ORDER  
PASSED BY THE ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
Head Assistant  
OFFICE OF THE LD. ESTATE OFFICER  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT

*[Handwritten signature]*

*[Handwritten signature]*



**Estate Officer, SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA**

Appointed by the Central Govt. Under Section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act 1971

1234, 1234/D of 2011 Order Sheet No. 84

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT, KOLKATA**

**VS**

**THE LABOUR COMMISSIONER WEST BENGAL**


28  
26.06.2023

incurrence of liability, till the liquidation of the same, as per the adjustment of payments, if any made so far by O.P., in terms of SMPK's books of accounts. I sign the formal orders u/s 7 of the Act.

I make it clear that SMPK is entitled to claim further damages against O.P. for unauthorized use and occupation of the public premises right upto the date of recovery of clear, vacant and unencumbered possession of the same in accordance with Law, and as such the liability of O.P. to pay damages extends beyond 30.09.2010 as well, till such time the possession of the premises continues to be under the unauthorised occupation with the O.P. SMPK is directed to submit a statement comprising details of its calculation of damages after 30.09.2010, indicating there-in, the details of the rate of such charges, and the period of the damages (i.e. till the date of taking over of possession) together with the basis on which such charges are claimed against O.P., for my consideration for the purpose of assessment of such damages as per Rule made under the Act.

I make it clear that in the event of failure on the part of O.P. to comply with this Order, Port Authority is entitled to proceed further for execution of this order in accordance with law. All concerned are directed to act accordingly.

GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL

  
(Kausik Kumar Manna)  
ESTATE OFFICER

By Order of:  
THE ESTATE OFFICER,  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
CERTIFIED COPY OF THE ORDER  
PASSED BY THE ESTATE OFFICER,  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
Head Assistant  
OFFICE OF THE LD. ESTATE OFFICER,  
SYAMA PRASAD MOOKERJEE PORT  
28/6/23

\*\*\* ALL EXHIBITS AND DOCUMENTS  
ARE REQUIRED TO BE TAKEN BACK  
WITHIN ONE MONTH FROM THE DATE  
OF PASSING OF THIS ORDER\*\*\*