

18.08.2025
Court No. 36
Sl. No. 04
Cp/Gb

WPCRC 112 of 2025
In
WPA No. 710 of 2023

Nripati Halder
-Vs.-
Dulali Halder

Mr. Sudip Sarkar
Mr. Sukdeb Sarkar

... for the applicant.

Mr. Saikat Chatterjee
Mr. Arun Kumar Halder

.....for the alleged contemnor.

Smt. Dulali Halder, Pradhan of Dhanurhat
Gram Panchayat is present in court in response to
the Rule.

A compliance report has been handed over
which shows that a reasoned order has been passed
and the construction of both the parties have been
found to be unauthorized. The parties have been
asked to remove the unauthorized construction
within 10 days from August 12, 2025, failing which
the gram panchayat has reserved the right to proceed
in accordance with law.

Mr. Saikat Chatterjee, learned advocate for the
alleged contemnor, submits that in terms of Section
23(5) of the Panchayat Act steps shall be taken to
transmit the records to the concerned Sub-Divisional
Officer. It is submitted specifically that the

construction of both the parties have been found to be unauthorized.

Learned advocate for the applicant/writ petitioner submits that the writ petitioner's construction is not a pucca construction, and as such, the law would not be applicable. However, this is not an issue which has to be decided in this proceeding because this is a contempt proceeding.

The court does not find any intentional violation of its order, save and except, the delay. The delay is condoned as steps have been taken by the gram panchayat.

The applicant shall be at liberty to challenge the order before the appropriate forum in accordance with law, if the applicant is aggrieved by the findings of the gram panchayat.

Accordingly, the contempt application is disposed of and the contempt proceeding is dropped. The Rule is discharged.

Personal appearance of the alleged contemnor is dispensed with.

(Shampa Sarkar, J.)