

05.09.2024
Item No.13
gd/ssd

WPA(P)/375/2024

SUJIT GUPTA
VS
STATE OF WEST BENGAL AND ORS.

Mr. Jishnu Saha,
Mr. Jishnu Chowdhury,
Mr. Ayan Poddar
..for the Petitioner.

1. This writ petition has been filed by a practicing advocate styled as a public interest writ petition and the main prayer sought for in the writ petition is to direct the respondent nos.1 and 2 to take all necessary steps to forbear the respondent no.3 from continuing to hold the so-called Bengal Bandh, which is to be held on 28th August, 2024 from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m.

2. The said so-called Bengal Bandh is already over and prayer (b) as also prayer (c) have become infructuous. Prayer (d) in the writ petition is for an interim order to the same effect and, therefore, the same also stands infructuous.

3. One factor which have greatly disturbed us is that the petitioner is one Mr. Sujit Gupta who has stated that he is a law abiding and peace loving citizen of the country and he is working for gain at the address and he is a practicing advocate regularly appearing

before this court and other courts in the State of West Bengal as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.

4. We recall that the identical prayer was sought for by another learned advocate which was dismissed on the ground that he was perpetually and eternally barred from filing the public interest litigation on account of his conduct, in another writ petition where this court has held that the said advocate had intimidated and posed threat to the office of the Chief Justice.

5. It is rather unfortunate to note that the present writ petition filed by Mr. Sujit Gupta who claims himself to be practicing before this court as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and other courts in the State of West Bengal has verbatim copied the affidavit filed in the earlier writ petition except the above first few paragraphs. Of course, we cannot term this as plagiarism but then none-the-less considering that the petitioner is a Member of Legal Profession stated to be practicing before this court as well as the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India and other courts in the State of West Bengal, in our humble view, he owes a responsibility and duty to the court as an officer of the court.

6. Thus, we are of the view that in the light of the fact that the prayer sought for in the writ petition has

become infructuous and the same cannot be entertained.

7. Accordingly, the writ petition stands dismissed.

(T. S. SIVAGNANAM)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(HIRANMAY BHATTACHARYYA, J.)