

**HIGH COURT OF TRIPURA
AGARTALA**

WP(C) 279/2026

Chunilal Das, son of late Maheswar Das, resident of Dhaleswar,
Natunpalli Road No.7, Agartala, West Tripura, Pin-799007.

..... PETITIONER

Versus

1. The State of Tripura, represented by the Secretary,
Revenue Department, Government of Tripura, New Secretariat
Building, New Capital Complex, Kunjaban, P.S. New Capital
Complex, Agartala, West Tripura, Pin-799010.

2. The District Magistrate & Collector, Office of DM &
Collector, West Tripura, Agartala, Pin-799001.

---Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. D. Paul, Advocate
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. D. Sarma, Addl. GA
Date of hearing & delivery of judgment	:	23.04.2026
Whether fit for reporting	:	No

BEFORE

HON'BLE JUSTICE DR. T. AMARNATH GOUD

Judgment & Order (Oral)

Heard Mr. D. Paul, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner
as well as Mr. D. Sarma, learned Additional GA appearing for the
State-respondents.

2. By means of filing this writ petition, the petitioner has
prayed for the following reliefs:

“i) Issue Rule upon the Respondents to show cause as to why a writ in the nature of Mandamus and/or order/orders and/or direction/ directions of like nature shall not be issued whereby directing the Respondents to expeditiously dispose of the Revenue Cases [Revenue Case No. 320/2014, Revenue Case No. 320/2015 & Petition dated 13.05.2019 u/s 11(3) of TLR&LR Act, 1960, arising out of Revenue Case No. 03/2016], pending before the District Magistrate & Collector, West Tripura.

ii) Make the Rules absolute,

iii) Call for records.

iv) Pass any further order/orders as the Hon'ble High Court considered fit and proper.”

3. The facts of the case, lies in a narrow compass, is that the
petitioner is the owner and possessor of land measuring 20 kanis

6 gandas by way of purchase under Mouja-Anandanagar, Tehsil-Srinagar. Since purchase, the petitioner has been possessing the suit land exercising his right, title and interest thereon by constructing house on the suit land. It is the case of the petitioner that some plots which are part and parcel of the suit land has not been mutated in the name of the petitioner for which the petitioner had been approaching the competent authority since long for taking necessary steps for such mutation. It is further case of the petitioner that relating to a proceeding, he has preferred a Revenue Case under Section 95 of the TLR & LR Act which was numbered as Revenue Case No. 320 of 2014 before the respondent No.2 herein. Subsequent thereto field inquiry was conducted and report was submitted by the Tehsilder showing ownership of the petitioner over 0.22 acres of land. Again the petitioner has filed a Revenue Case under Section 95 of the TLR & LR Act which was numbered as Revenue Case No. 320 of 2015 before the respondent No.2 herein. It is further case of the petitioner that vide Allotment Order dated 05.05.1986 one Bimal Chandra Majumder and his wife got allotment of 0.83 acres of land which is within the part and parcel of the purchased land of the petitioner measuring 8 kanis challenging which the petitioner filed a petition under Section 11(3) of TLR & LR Act before the respondent no. 2 and the same was registered as Revenue Case No. 3 of 2016. The grievance of the petitioner is that till date the respondent no. 2 did not pass any effective order in the Revenue cases so filed by the petitioner. The petitioner also submitted legal notice dated 27.12.2025 upon the

respondent no. 2 herein with a prayer for deciding and disposing the revenue cases filed by the petitioner. Ventilating his grievance, the petitioner has filed the instant writ petition.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner urged this court to direct the respondents to dispose of the representation dated 27.12.2025 submitted by the petitioner.

5. Mr. K. De, learned Additional GA appearing for the State-respondents has in all fairness submitted to pass appropriate order.

6. This court has perused the record and also has gone through the correspondences made therein. The court is to be governed by the principle of justice, equity and good conscious. Needless to say, the petitioner has approached the respondents by notices raising his grievances and finding no alternative, he has also served legal notice, which has not been disposed of till date, and thus, this may cause serious prejudice to the petitioner. However, without entering into the merits of the case, this Court directs the respondents to consider the representation of the petitioner, if so filed, and dispose of the same within 3 (three) months from today. This court hopes and trusts that the respondents shall definitely dispose the representation of the petitioner with a reasoned order.

The instant writ petition is disposed of in the aforesaid manner.

Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed.

JUDGE

SAIKAT KAR

Digitally signed by
SAIKAT KAR
Date: 2026.04.24
18:19:34 -04'00'