

August 8, 2025
Sl. No.13
Court No.8
s.biswas

WPA(P) 117 of 2022

Kalyan Chaubey and others
vs.
The Municipal Commissioner, Kolkata Municipal Corporation and others

Mr. Srijan Nayak
Ms. Susmita Chatterjee

... for the KMC

1. None appears on behalf of the petitioners.
2. Mr. Nayak, learned advocate for the respondent nos.1 and 2, submitted its report and raised specific objection that the relief claimed is vague and ambiguous. A bald relief is claimed for preparation of list of unauthorized and illegal construction and take action against such construction. No details of such alleged illegal constructions have been mentioned in the petition and in absence thereof, no effective reply can be filed.
3. We have gone through the averments of petition and we find substantial force in the argument of learned counsel for the municipality that the averments are ambiguous in nature. No specific details of alleged illegal construction have been provided. Thus, no roving enquiry can be directed in this PIL. In absence of minimum essential details provided by the petitioners in

relation to the alleged illegal construction,
interference is declined.

4. Thus, the PIL is dismissed.

(Sujoy Paul, J.)

(Smita Das De, J.)