

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA**  
*CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION*  
APPELLATE SIDE

Before:

**The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jay Sengupta**

**WPA 10766 of 2023**

Setara Begum  
Vs.  
The State of West Bengal & Anr.

For the Petitioner : Mr. Debabrata Saha Roy,  
Mr. Pingal Bhattacharyya,  
Mr. Neil Basu,  
Mr. Sankha Biswas.

For the State : Ms. Sonal Sinha.

Heard on : 04.05.2023

Judgement on : 04.05.2023

**Jay Sengupta, J. :**

1. This is an application under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking a direction upon the respondent authorities to set aside the order no.36/MDM/2023 vide memo no.217/1(7)/MDM/MSD dated 31.03.2023 issued by the District Magistrate, Murshidabad, so far it curtailed eight gram panchayats from the petitioner's operational area and tagged the same with

the other distributorship in respect of engagement or appointment of carrying-cum-distribution agent of Mid- Day Meal rice in the district of Murshidabad.

2. Affidavit of service filed on behalf of the petitioner is taken on record.
3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows.

The petitioner is a distributor in the district of Murshidabad. The operational area covers the entire municipality of Dhuliyān, entire block of Farakka and the entire Shamsheganj Block except Nimtita Gram Panchayat, Chachanda Gram Panchayat and Umrapur Gram Panchayat (Suti-II). For the purpose of distributing mid day meal rice, the respondent authorities had been engaging the distributors for such areas. Practically in all other cases, the same has been done. But the petitioner has not been engaged as the carrying-cum-distribution agent for all the areas that her distributorship covers. She has been only engaged for such capacity in the areas of entire municipality of Dhuliyān and entire Farakka block. Accordingly, the petitioner made the representation before the District Magistrate for her engagement for the other areas, which she covers as distributor. The same has not been considered as yet.

4. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits that the respondent no.4 being the District Magistrate would be the appropriate authority to consider such representation.
5. I have heard the submissions of the learned Counsels appearing on behalf of the parties and have perused the writ petition.
6. It appears that the petitioner's representation as referred to above has remained pending.
7. Let the respondent no.4 consider the writ petitioner's representation within a fortnight from the date of communication of this order upon hearing the petitioner and thereafter, communicate the result to the petitioner, within a week.
8. With these observations, the writ petition is disposed of.
9. As affidavits have not been exchanged, allegations are deemed not to have been accepted.
10. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order may be supplied to the parties expeditiously, if applied for.

**(Jay Sengupta, J.)**

SI. 58/NB