

D/L - 19
26.02.2025
Court. No. 25
S.Kundu

W.P.A. 3202 of 2025

**Gouri Rani Jana
Vs.
State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. N.I. Khan,
Mr. Amlan Kr. Mukherjee

...for the petitioner.

Mr. K.J. Yusuf,
Mr. P. Goswami

...for the State.

1. Affidavit of service filed on behalf of the petitioner is taken on record.
2. The petitioner's grievance is that, in departure of the time table granted to him, he, as a valid permit holder, has been subjected to a newly published "provisional consolidated time table", on and from the date of its publication, that is, May 18, 2022.
3. Mr. Khan is representing the petitioner. He has expressed the petitioner's grievance, that the time table being the condition of permit, has to be duly circulated, though the said provisional consolidated time table is without any such compliance. He has stated further that the issuing authority, that is, RTA, Purba Medinipur is not authorised as per law, to issue any time table. In such view of the fact, the said provisional consolidated time table is bereft of any legal sanction or sanctity in the eye of law. The petitioner has sought for

revival of his earlier time table by dint of submitting letters before the Secretary, RTA, Purba Medinipur, dated October 12, 2022 and May 02, 2023, respectively. Allegedly also that neither of the representations of the petitioner, have yet been considered by the said respondent authority.

4. Mr. Goswami led by Mr. Yusuf learned advocate, is appearing for the State respondent.
5. On perusal of the records and upon hearing submission of the learned respective counsels for the parties, it appears that the petitioner though has been issued a time table previously, has been, however, directed to follow a provisional consolidated time table, during subsistence of the earlier time table issued to him and without cancellation thereof and by superseding the same, without any justifiable reason shown, that too by an office which is not authorised under the law for issuance of a time table. He seeks that the original time table of the petitioner be restored for him to follow.
6. Under such circumstances, the Court finds it necessary to direct the respondent No. 4 to immediately consider the representations of the petitioner as above i.e. dated October 12, 2022 and May 02, 2023 respectively, in accordance with law.
7. Let a decision thereon be taken by the respondent No. 4, positively within a period of three weeks from the date of communication of a copy of this order and after

granting reasonable opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. He shall inform the petitioner his order, within one week from its date.

8. Since no affidavit-in-opposition is called for, all allegations made in the writ petition are deemed to have been denied by the respondents.
9. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of.
10. All parties shall act on the basis of the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.

(Rai Chattopadhyay, J.)