

**1605
2025**

FRIDAY

Court : CB-07
Item : DL-09
Bench : SINGLE
Matter : WPA
Status : DO
ID : 266057
AR : NANDY

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE**

WPA 10003 OF 2022

M/S. TECHNOPRINT DESIGNERS & PRINTER & ANR.
VS.
UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

**MR. SANKAR PAUL, ADVOCATE
MS. KUMARI SHIPRA ROY, ADVOCATE**

.....for the Petitioners

1. Despite service, the respondents are unrepresented.
2. The present writ petition has been filed alleging inaction on the part of the respondents regarding the payment for charges related to type-setting and DTP work.
3. Briefly, the facts leading to the filing of this writ petition are that the petitioner, a proprietorship firm operating under the name and style of M/s. Technoprint Designers & Printers, is engaged in the business of computer typing, printing, and DTP work.
4. Respondent No. 2 issued two separate work orders, both dated 25.09.2017, in favour of the petitioner to carry out specific computer typing, printing, and DTP work for the senior secondary course in the subjects of Biology and Chemistry in Bengali medium. The petitioners completed the work as per the terms of the work orders; however, despite submitting the final bill, no payment has been made. This inaction has prompted the petitioners to file the present writ petition.
5. Mr. Sankar Paul, learned Advocate representing the petitioner, submits that after executing the work assigned to it in terms of the two work orders, the petitioner-firm raised the Bill. However, despite receipt of such Bill, no payment has been made by the respondent no. 2. The petitioner approached the

authority on several occasions, even the learned advocate for the petitioner gave legal notice to the respondent; however, the same also did not yield any favourable response.

6. He submits that an appropriate direction should be issued to ensure that payment is made for the work completed by the petitioner-firm in accordance with the work orders dated 25.09.2017.
7. Heard the learned Advocate appearing for the petitioner and perused the materials-on-record.
8. The case record indicates that through the work orders dated 25.09.2017, certain tasks were assigned to the petitioner-firm. Subsequently, the petitioner approached the respondent no. 2 on several occasions, informing them that the courses were ready for PDF conversion as per the respondent's requirements.
9. However, as asserted by the petitioner, no payment has been made for the work completed by the petitioner-firm pursuant to those work orders.
10. In these circumstances, the writ petition is disposed of, granting liberty to the petitioners to submit a comprehensive representation before respondent no. 2 within 15 days from the date of this order. Upon receipt of such representation, respondent no. 2 shall take a decision thereon after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner.
11. It is clarified that if respondent no. 2 finds merit in the petitioner's claim, appropriate follow-up action shall be taken, including the payment for the services rendered by the petitioner-firm in accordance with the work orders. However, if respondent no. 2 finds that the petitioner's claim lacks merit, a reasoned order shall be passed and communicated to the petitioner.
12. The entire exercise shall be completed within a

period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of such representation from the petitioner.

13. With this order and observations, **WPA 10003 of 2022** is **disposed of**.

(PARTHA SARATHI CHATTERJEE, J.)