

2.1.2025
Ct. 39
Sl.no.4
samarpita

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

**WPA 24073 of 2015
CAN 1/2024, CAN 2/2024**

**Premamoy Chowdhury
-Vs-
State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Ms. Sohini Chakraborty,
Mr. Suman Chattopadhyay

... for the petitioner

Mr. Satyajit Talukder,
Mr. Arindom Chatterjee

.. for the respondent Nos. 3 to 6

Mr. Suman Sengupta,
Mr. Gourav Das

..for the State

Affidavit-of-service filed on behalf of the
petitioner is taken on record.

CAN 2 of 2024

This is an application for condonation of delay in
filing the restoration application.

Ms. Sohini Chakraborty, learned advocate
appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that
due to certain property disputes in the family and at
the same time the petitioner was required to go out of
the city, he could not contact his learned advocate
which has resulted in dismissal of this writ petition
as well as delay in filing the application for

restoration. She prays for condonation of delay of 52 days in filing the restoration application.

Mr. Satyajit Talukder, learned advocate representing the respondent Nos. 3 to 6 leaves the matter to the discretion of the Court.

On going through the averments made in the application, it is found that the cause shown is sufficient to condone the delay of 52 days in filing the restoration application. Accordingly the delay in filing the restoration application is condoned.

The application being **CAN 2 of 2024** is allowed and disposed of.

CAN 1 of 2024

This is an application for restoration of the writ petition dismissed for default on 30th January, 2024.

Ms. Sohini Chakraborty, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that due to certain property disputes in the family and at the same time the petitioner was required to go out of the city, he could not contact his learned advocate which has resulted in dismissal of this writ petition. She prays for restoration of the writ petition.

On going through the averments made in the application, it is found that the grounds shown are sufficient to restore the writ petition. Accordingly, the order dated 30th January, 2024 is recalled.

The writ petition is restored to its original file and number.

The application being **CAN 1 of 2024** stands allowed and disposed of.

WPA 24073 of 2015

Both the learned advocates representing the State-respondents as well as respondent Nos. 3 to 6-KMDA, seeks extension of time to file affidavit-in-opposition.

Let such affidavits-in-opposition be filed within a period of three weeks. Reply thereto, if any, be filed within two weeks thereafter.

List this matter after five weeks.

(**Bivas Pattanayak, J.**)