

Ashok Ghosh Vs. State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Barun Kumar Samanta
...for the petitioner.

Mr. Srijan Nayak
Mrs. Rituparna Maitra
...for the State.

The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that even when there are vacancies in route no. 45 and 44A, the respondent authorities have cancelled the application of the petitioner dated 18th November, 2019 stating that there is “no vacancy and is thus rejected”.

Mr. Nayak, learned Advocate appearing for the State submits that the questions of facts as agitated by the petitioner can only be resolved by the State Authorities.

I request the Regional Transport Authority, Kolkata Region, being the respondent no. 2 in the instant application to consider the writ petition of the petitioner as a representation before him.

The learned advocate-on-record of the petitioner is requested to serve a copy of this order along with a copy of the writ petition upon the Regional Transport Authority, Kolkata.

The Regional Transport Authority, Kolkata Region is requested to treat the writ petition as a representation of the petitioner and consider the same within a period of twelve weeks from date after giving an opportunity of hearing to the necessary parties including the petitioner as well as allow the petitioner to submit necessary documents before him.

The respondent no. 2 will pass a reasoned order within twelve

weeks from date and communicate the same to the petitioner at an earliest.

I make it clear that I have not gone into the merits of the writ petition, all the issues are left open to the Regional Transport Authority, Kolkata Region, being the respondent no. 2 to be decided by him.

Since no affidavits have been invited, the allegations contained to the writ petition are deemed not to have been admitted by the respondents.

The writ petition is disposed of.

There will be no order as to costs.

The parties shall act in terms of the copy of the order downloaded from the official website of this Court.

(Rajarshi Bharadwaj, J.)