

20. 02.04.2025  
Court No.05.

(Pritam)

**WPA 6620 of 2025**

**Moumita Sikari**

**-Vs.-**

**The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Arif Ali,  
Mr. Surojit Saha.

...for the petitioner.

Mr. Subhendu Bandyopadhyay,  
Ms. Molly Saha.

...for the State.

Mr. S. Bhattacharya.

....for respondent no.6.

1. Affidavit-of-service filed in court today be taken on record.
2. The instant writ petition has been filed, *inter alia*, praying for a direction upon the respondents to release a sum of Rs.2,62,500/- in favour of the petitioner.
3. The petitioner claims to be a member of Janani Swarojgari Dal, a self-help group. According to the petitioner the respondent no.6 had engaged the petitioner for stitching school uniforms. It is the petitioner's case that in usual course the respondent no.6 engages the petitioner for stitching school uniforms @ of Rs. 250/- per uniform, which includes (shirt and one pant).

4. Mr. Ali, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the petitioner by drawing the attention of this Court to the document at page 12 of the petition would submit that the petitioner had been engaged by the respondent no.6 for stitching the uniforms for Shyamnagar Milon Sishu Siksha Kendra and S.G.M.C. Vidyaniketan (High School).
5. By referring to the delivery challans, which are annexed to the writ petition, it is submitted that the petitioner had duly executed the work.
6. According to Mr. Ali, the petitioner comes from a marginalised section of the society. The petitioner has been running from pillar to post for release of payments in connection with execution of above work. The petitioner had also through an advocate's communication in writing dated March 6, 2025 requested the BDO, Joynagar-1 Block to look into the matter and release a sum of Rs.2,62,500/- in favor of the petitioner.
7. Mr. Ali, learned advocate for the petitioner by placing before this court a communication dated March 21, 2025 issued in response to the representation dated March 6, 2025 would submit that the Office of the BDO Joynagar-1 Block while disclosing that no work order had been issued in favour of the petitioner, has been categorical in stating that as per the Government order held in the meeting of BLMC on

March 4, 2025 (Dhosa Chandaneswar Sabuj Sangha Prathamik Bahumukhi Samabay Samity Ltd) the respondent no.6 had been selected for stitching of school uniforms for Dhosa SGMC Vidyaniketan High School and Shyamnagar Milonnagar Sishu Siksha Kendra. A copy of the aforesaid letter dated March 21, 2025 as placed before this court be retained with the records.

8. The State respondents and respondent no.6 are represented.

9. Considering that the petitioner may have executed the job on behalf of the respondent no.6 in relation to the work orders issued by the BDO in favour of the respondent no.6, I am of the view that the petitioners may be permitted to make an appropriate representation by placing reliance on the communication dated March 21, 2025 with the Office of the respondent no.5 along with all supporting documents for the State respondents to take a decision in the matter and consider the said representation..

10. In the event the aforesaid representation is made within four weeks from date, the respondent no.5 shall be obliged to consider such representation and may also call for an appropriate report from the respondent no.6 for the State respondent to finally decide on the petitioner's entitlement. If on the basis

of the decision to be taken by the respondent no.5, the petitioner is found eligible to the amount as may be ascertained for having executed the work, which was assigned to the respondent no.6 by the BDO, the respondent no.5 shall take appropriate steps for disbursement of such sum as he may be deemed fit and is due and payable in favour of the petitioner.

11. The entire process should be completed within six weeks from the filing of the representation by the petitioner with the respondent no.5.
12. With the aforesaid direction, the instant writ petition being WPA 6620 of 2025 stands disposed of.
13. Since no affidavit-in-opposition is called for, the allegations made in the petitioner are deemed to have been attempted.
14. There shall be no order as to costs.

**(Raja Basu Chowdhury, J.)**