

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side**

Ct.551 **12.09.25**
Item No.4 Sws.M

**WPA 8918 of 2025
(Assigned)**

**Shri Rabindranath Rana
Vs
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Phatick Chandra Das

...for the petitioner

Mr. Soumitra Bandopadhyay, Ld. Sr. Govt. Adv
Ms. Suchana Banerjee

....for the State

Mr. Sanjay Saha
Mr. Raju Mondal

....for the respondent No. 4

1. The petitioner is aggrieved by an order dated March 11, 2025 passed by the Additional District Magistrate and District Land & Land Reforms Officer, Paschim Medinipur whereby the facility of generation of e-challan in respect of the petitioner's vehicle has been blocked on the central online portal (such that e-challan would not be issued for the petitioner's vehicle on the central online portal till the same is unblocked) and a penalty/fine of a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees one lakh only) has been imposed.
2. Briefly summed up, the case run in the writ petition is as follows:

- a. The petitioner owns a twelve wheeler vehicle which is used by him for his business of carrying riverbed material/sand throughout West Bengal.
- b. On or about March 9, 2025 a road e-challan was issued in respect of the said vehicle for transportation of sand/riverbed material from Subarnarekha, Jhargram to North Kolkata.
- c. The petitioner's vehicle set off for the destination in terms of the said e-challan but the petitioner's was intercepted by one officer from the District Land and Land Reforms Office, Paschim Medinipur. The said officer sought for monetary gratification from the driver of the vehicle and threatened him that failure to honour the demand would lead to blocking of issuance of e-challan in respect of the said vehicle.
- d. Ultimately on March 11, 2025 the Additional District Magistrate and District Land & Land Reforms Officer, Paschim Medinipur passed an order of even date thereby blocking issuance of e-challan in respect of the said vehicle and imposing fine of a sum of Rs. 1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only). The order commands that payment of the fine as imposed within a period of seven days was mandatory to get the e-challan generation facility unblocked.
- e. The petitioner made a representation dated March 12, 2025 against the said order dated March 11, 2025 but the same has remained unheeded.

- f. Being aggrieved by the said order dated March 11, 2025, the petitioner has approached this Court by way of the present writ petition.
3. Learned advocate appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the order dated March 11, 2025 has been passed without hearing the petitioner and the reason mentioned therein is wholly without basis. It is submitted that the order dated March 11, 2025 indicates that the petitioner's vehicle was carrying sand/riverbed materials "with overload(03)", but the petitioner was carrying sand/riverbed material in terms of the valid challan. It is further submitted that he is being penalized for no fault of his own. The learned Advocate appearing for the petitioner further submits that the authority concerned has no power to block the e-challan generation facility and to impose fine.
4. The learned Advocate appearing for the State Respondents submits that the order impugned has been validly passed. It is submitted that when the petitioner's vehicle which was carrying sand/riverbed material was intercepted the same was overloaded.
5. It is also submitted that in terms of Rule 51 of the West Bengal Minor Minerals Concession Rules, 2016, once an order blocking the e-challan generation facility and imposing fine is passed by the appropriate authority, the petitioner would have to approach the appellate authority by preferring an appeal and a writ petition

assailing such order should not be entertained. It is further submitted that in terms of Rule 50(1) of the West Bengal Minor Minerals Concession Rules, 2016, the Additional District Magistrate and District Land & Land Reforms Officer has authority to block the e-challan generation facility as well as to impose fine. Copy of instructions handed up to Court by the learned Advocate for the Respondent is taken on record.

6. Heard the learned Advocates appearing for the respective parties and considered the material on record. The order impugned in this writ petition i.e. the order dated March 11, 2025 that the same is wholly unreasoned. Before proceeding to penalize the petitioner, the order only states that the petitioner's vehicle was "intercepted by the Checking Officer at KHARAGPUR for carrying Sand/Riverbed materials "without overload (03)". The order does not state as to how it was found that the petitioner's vehicle was overloaded and as to by what extent did it deviate the quantity mentioned in the e-challan. Since the petitioner's vehicle has been found by the Additional District Magistrate and District Land & Land Reforms Officer, Paschim Medinipur, to be overloaded the basis of such conclusion must have been disclosed. The order should have disclosed the method of weight determination following which the vehicle was found to be overlaoded. The order is one that triggers civil

consequences inasmuch as it has led to the blocking of e-challan generation in respect of a vehicle used for transportation of sand/riverbed material and imposition of fine. Furthermore, such order in the considered view of this Court should have been passed only after hearing the writ petitioner. The learned Advocate appearing for the Respondent could not refute the contention of the learned Advocate for the petitioner that the order dated March 11, 2025 has been passed without hearing the writ petitioner. The said order dated March 11, 2025 therefore deserves interference.

7. As regards the contention of there being an appellate remedy, it is settled law that alternative remedy is not a complete bar to the entertainment of a writ petition, if the order impugned is wholly unreasoned or has been passed in violation of the principles of natural justice. The writ petition is therefore entertained.
8. As regards the writ petitioner's contention that the respondent Additional District Magistrate and District Land & Land Reforms Officer has no power to block e - challan generation facility, this Court is satisfied that the Additional District Magistrate and District Land & Land Reforms Officer has power to block e-challan in respect of the petitioner's vehicle. It is the writ petitioner's case that the vehicle in question was carrying sand/riverbed material. In such view of the matter the provisions of the West Bengal Sand (Mining,

Transportation, Storage and Sale) Rules, 2021 would apply to the writ petitioner's case. If the provisions of Rules 25 (1) and (2) of the West Bengal Sand (Mining, Transportation, Storage and Sale) Rules, 2021 are read cumulatively and meaningfully, it will be clear that such power to block e-challan generation facility is indeed vested with the relevant authority. For the facility of reference, the said Rule is quoted hereinbelow:

25. Power to Seize: -

(1) Whenever any person carries out any sand mining operations or causes to be carried out any sand mining operations without any lawful authority, and for that purpose, uses any tool, equipment, carrier, or any other thing ("property"), such property shall be liable to be seized by the Authorised Officer.

(2) Every Authorized Officer seizing any property under these Rules shall photograph the property and place on such property a mark in such manner as may be specified, indicating that the same has been so seized and shall raise a ticket on the centralized portal and inform the person from whom the property is seized, in writing about such seizure and the applicable amount for release of property so seized.

9. The action of seizing the property and raising “*a ticket on the centralized portal and inform the person from whom the property is seized*” as mentioned in Rule 25(2) of the West Bengal Sand (Mining, Transportation, Storage and Sale) Rules, 2021 read together in the context of a vehicle used for transportation of sand would certainly indicate power to block e-challan generation facility, in order to prevent user of the relevant vehicle for illegal transportation of sand. However, such power must be exercised in manner compatible with the principles of natural justice and the same must be based on reasons. Law in this regard is fairly well settled.
10. In the case at hand although the Court has found that the order impugned deserves interference, yet, since the matter involves an allegation of illegal or unauthorized transportation of sand/river bed material which are highly regulated minor minerals, given their extreme importance for environmental sustainability as well as economic stability of the country this Court is not minded to totally vacate the blocking of e-challan as done by the respondent Additional District Magistrate and District Land & Land Reforms Officer. Likewise, since the blocking of e-challan generation facility as aforesaid has the effect of restricting the petitioner’s fundamental right to continue with or carry on the business of transporting sand/river bed

material, such blocking that has been imposed at the very threshold cannot also be allowed to be continued for an indeterminate period without furnishing proper reasons therefor and without hearing the petitioner. In such view of the matter, in order to balance equity with law, the order impugned is modified to the following extent:

- a) The portion of the order whereby fine/penalty to the tune of Rs.1,00,000/- (Rupees One Lakh only) has been imposed upon the petitioner for the purpose of seeking unblocking of the petitioner vehicle to facilitate generation of e-challan is quashed.
- b) Blocking of the e-challan generation facility as imposed by the order dated March 11, 2025 would remain limited to a period of two working weeks from the date of communication of this order.
- c) Within the said period of two working weeks (from the date of communication of this order), the Additional District Magistrate and District Land & Land Reforms Officer, Paschim Medinipur shall afford an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner and pass a reasoned order, strictly in accordance with law, after considering the writ petitioner's contention. Needless to mention that the petitioner shall be entitled to present his case in writing.
- d) It is clarified that if the Additional District Magistrate and District Land & Land Reforms

Officer, Paschim Medinipur is not satisfied with the writ petitioner's submissions/contentions, the said authority shall be free to continue the blocking of the e-challan facility in respect of the petitioner's vehicle and/or to impose fine upon the petitioner, as may be permissible in law.

11. WPA 8918 of 2025 stands disposed of. There shall, however, be no order as to costs.
12. Since no Affidavit-in-Opposition has been invited, allegations made in the writ petition are deemed not to have been admitted by the respondents.
13. Urgent certified photocopy of this order, if applied for, be supplied as expeditiously as possible.

(Om Narayan Rai, J.)