

December 1, 2025
(15) ARDR

WPA 9295 of 2023
CAN 1 of 2025

Amar Rui Das
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & ors.

Adv. Sk. Nizamuddin,
Adv. Barnali Gupta,
...for the petitioner.

Adv. Sourojit Dasgupta,
Adv. Aasish Choudhury,
Adv. Uma Bagree,
...for the intervenor.

Adv. Ashim Kumar Ganguly,
Adv. Bellal Shaikh,
....for the State.

Report submitted by the State and the affidavit of service filed by the applicant are taken on record.

The application being CAN 1 of 2025 is not in the file.

Copy of the application produced by the applicant is treated as the original application and is taken on record.

The petitioner complains that the private respondents are trying to raise a boundary wall in his property illegally.

It appears from the report submitted by the State that the petitioner sold out the property in question to one Gopal Saraf who is one of the designated partners of S.L. Properties LLP for consideration of Rs.9 lakhs by virtue of a registered deed of conveyance. This fact has been suppressed by the petitioner in the writ petition. The petitioner still claims to be the owner of the property by suppressing the fact of sale of the property to Gopal Saraf.

In view of the above, this Court is inclined to hold that the petitioner has not come with clean hands and does not deserve any relief.

Accordingly the writ petition is dismissed.

In the result, the application being CAN 1 of 2023 is disposed of.

However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to approach the appropriate forum for redressal of his grievance.

There shall however, be no order as to costs.

Urgent certified website copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance with all requisite formalities.

(Suvra Ghosh, J.)