

06.07.2021

Item no. 26

D d

(Through Video Conference)

WPA 9269 of 2021

Sri Vibekananda Bag
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Ms. Chittapriya Ghosh, Adv.
... .. For the Petitioner

Mr. Jishnu Chowdhury, Adv.
... ..For the Respondents

The petitioner complains that the petitioner is not permitted to execute the work despite a work order, being Memo no. 526 dated November, 15, 2018 being issued by the Superintending Engineer and Administrator, Kangsabati Command Area Development Authority.

Learned advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that subsequent to the work order being issued, a writ petition was filed by various people complaining that the work order if executed would affect private land. Subsequently, such writ petition was disposed of. At present there is no hindrance to the work being carried out. He submits that the petitioner made a representation dated February 22, 2021 which is yet to be decided.

The State is represented.

In such circumstances, since the representation dated February 22, 2021 is yet to be considered and decided, it would be appropriate to direct the respondent no. 3 to consider and decide

the representation dated February 22, 2021 made by the petitioner in accordance with law. The respondent no. 3 will afford the petitioner a reasonable opportunity of hearing. The respondent no. 3 is at liberty to hear such parties, as he deems necessary. He will pass a reasoned order which he will communicate to the petitioner forthwith thereafter. It is expected that the entire exercise is completed within four weeks from the date of communication of this order to the respondent no. 3.

WPA 9269 of 2021 is disposed of accordingly.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)