

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA  
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION  
APPELLATE SIDE**

**Present:**

**The Hon'ble Justice Debangsu Basak**

**And**

**The Hon'ble Justice Md. Shabbar Rashidi**

**FMA 745 of 2025**

**Subhranil Pramanik**

**Vs.**

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

For the Petitioner : Mr. Kapil Chandra Sahoo, Advocate  
Mr. Gouranga Kumar Das, Advocate  
Mr. Kartik Das, Advocate

Heard & Judgment on : May 2, 2025

**DEBANGSU BASAK, J.:-**

1. Appeal is directed against an order dated March 6, 2025 passed in WPA 4543 of 2025 by the learned Single Judge.
2. Appellant before us claim to purchase an immovable property subsequent to acquisition proceedings being taken with regard thereto and the property being vested.
3. Learned Advocate appearing for the appellant submits that, a portion of the property was acquired while the other portion was retained by the original owner. Appellant purchased the entire property. The

original owner did not receive any compensation. Therefore, the appellant is entitled to the compensation for the portion which was acquired by the State. Moreover, he contends that, since no award was passed within time, the entire acquisition proceedings is bad.

4. The appeal paper is yet to be served upon the respondents. However, without the respondents appearing, we decided to take up the appeal for consideration.
5. On the admitted position, of the appellant, it transpires that a portion of the land purchased by the appellant was acquired. In response to a query of the Court, it is admitted that, such portion stood vested on the State much prior to the so-called purchase of the appellant. Therefore, appellant as a post vesting transferee does not possess any right, title and interest in respect of the portion of the land acquired. Appellant, therefore, is not entitled to receive any compensation in respect of the portion of the land that stood vested and was acquired by the State. Appellant cannot be heard with regard to the validity of the acquisition proceedings.
6. So far as the portion of the land which, the appellant claims, did not stand vested, obviously, the appellant is not entitled to any compensation with regard thereto.
7. We clarify that, we did not return any finding that, any portion of the land claimed to be purchased by the appellant was not acquired by the State.

8. We find no merit in the present appeal.
9. **FMA 745 of 2025** is **dismissed** without any order as to costs.

**(Debangsu Basak, J.)**

10. I agree.

**(Md. Shabbar Rashidi, J.)**

(AD)