

23.04.2025
Sl. No.57
Ct.3/ tkm

W.P.A. 7214 of 2025
[*Ratna Das vs. Chairman, Jangipur Municipality & Ors.*]

Mr. Rishabh Karnani
Mr. Anurag Bagaria
... .. for the petitioner

Mr. U A Dewan
Mr. A Dewan
... .. for the municipality

1. Petitioner in the present writ petition is challenging the action of the respondent municipality whereby steel barricades were put in front of petitioner's shop situated at holding no. 157/144, Fultala, PO Raghunathganj, Ward no. 20, district Murshidabad thereby causing obstruction to the ingress and egress to the petitioner's shop.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that earlier also in the year 2021 respondent municipality had installed the same steel barricades in front of the petitioner's shop which was challenged by the Petitioner's tenant in writ petition no. WPA 16529 of 2021. However, even before the said matter was listed, the respondent municipality had removed the steel barricade.
3. In view of the same, the said writ petition was disposed of by order dated 7.10.2021 directing the respondent municipality that the entrance to

the shop of the petitioner shall not be obstructed blocking his ingress and egress.

4. Thereafter, there was no barricade till 20.5.2023.

On 20.5.2023 the municipality had again installed the steel barricade and the petitioner challenged the said action of the respondent municipality in another writ petition no. WPA 16186 of 2023. Vide order dated 3.4.2024 the said writ petition was disposed of by directing the respondent municipality to consider and decide the petitioner's representation in light of the order dated 7.10.2021 in the earlier writ petition no. WPA 16529 of 2021, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. However, till date neither any hearing has been given nor any order has been passed.

5. In view thereof, the present writ petition has been filed wherein again the petitioner is seeking similar relief. The petitioner has again filed representation dated 19.8.2024.

6. Learned counsel for the respondent municipality appears and states that they will carry out the directions passed in the earlier writ petition wherein the municipality was directed to decide the petitioner's representation. He assures this court that necessary compliance of the earlier order shall be done within a period of four weeks.

7. Ld. Counsel for the Petitioner submits that the petitioner shall be satisfied if his earlier representation is decided in accordance with law.
8. In view of the aforesaid statement nothing survives in the present writ petition. Hence the present writ petition is disposed of.

(Gaurang Kanth, J.)