

**In The High Court At Calcutta  
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction  
Appellate Side**

**W.P.A 10376 of 2023**

**Nirupama Hazra  
-versus  
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

**Mr. Malay Bhattacharya.  
Mr. Raju Mondal  
Ms. Sudipa Sen Gupta  
...For the Petitioner.**

None represents the respondents.

The petitioner submits that the reasoned order passed by the Kanksa Gram Panchayat does not mention anything with regard to the status of the land in question whether the disputed construction has been made.

It has been submitted that as per the report of the Revenue Inspector dated 21.01.2013 the disputed construction has been made over Dag No. 2846 which is vested to the State.

The reasoned order of the gram panchayat does not mention whether the construction was made over a private land or the government property.

Allegation is that the construction has been made without a valid sanction plan. The reasoned order appears to have been passed upon inspection of both the parties.

The construction in question was found to be in existence for a considerable period of time, even prior to the formation of the gram panchayat.

The facts mentioned in the impugned reasoned order are disputed by the petitioner. In the absence of contemporaneous documents in support of the stand of the petitioner, the writ petition with disputed questions of facts cannot be adjudicated by the writ Court.

In view of the above, no relief can be granted to the petitioner in the instant writ petition.

The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

Urgent certified photocopy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties expeditiously on compliance of usual legal formalities.

**( Amrita Sinha, J.)**