

WPA 2881 of 2025

**Madhu Sudan Mondal
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Dilip Kumar Maity

... .. for the Petitioner

Mr. Sk. Md. Galib

Ms. Priyamvada Singh

... .. for the State

1. Affidavit of service filed today is taken on record.
2. There is no representation on behalf of the respondent no.8 i.e., Pradhan, 5 No. Kakharda Gram Panchayat (Sahid Matangini Panchayat Samity).
3. The writ petitioner has approached this Court complaining that the petitioner's representation dated January 20, 2025 whereby the petitioner had raised concerns about the illegal felling trees by the respondent no.5 has not been considered.
4. On August 25, 2025 when the matter was taken up for hearing the learned advocate appearing for the State respondents had handed up to Court a copy of instructions dated February 11, 2025 forwarded to her by the Additional Forest Officer, Purba Medinipur Forest Division which revealed that no permission for felling trees had been granted to the Pradhan, 5 No. Kakharda

Gram Panchayat (Sahid Matangini Panchayat Samity) by the competent authority.

5. The learned Advocate appearing for the State hands up to Court a set of instructions dated August 26, 2025 forwarded to her by the Additional Forest Officer, Purba Medinipur Forest Division, wherefrom it appears that upon an application by the respondent no.5 which was submitted online on January 21, 2025 seeking permission to fell 1823 trees for the purpose of *“re-excavation of Soyadighi Canal under Sahid Matangini Block”*, the Additional Forest Officer, Purba Medinipur Forest Division had issued a certificate of clearance on March 03, 2025 and granted permission for felling of 1589 trees. The instructions handed up to Court also reveals that out of the said 1589 trees for felling which permission had been granted, 119 trees were standing within JL No.43 i.e. the area referred to by the petitioner in the writ petition. It therefore appears that the petitioner’s grievance that the respondent no.5 had fell trees without the permission of the respondent Forest authorities does not have any basis.
6. However, since a representation had been made by the petitioner as far back as on January 20, 2025 to the respondent no.4, the said respondent should have disposed of the said

representation more so since an allegation of illegal felling of trees had been made. That would have saved judicial time spent in dealing with the present writ petition.

7. Be that as it may in view of the instructions handed up to Court today wherefrom it appears that permission to fell trees had been granted, no further order needs to be passed in this writ petition. WPA 2881 of 2025 therefore stands disposed of. No costs.

8. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all formalities.

(Om Narayan Rai, J.)