

S/L 28
18.07.2025
Court. No. 19
Sourav

WPA 11460 of 2025

Goutam Das
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Sandip Ray

...for the petitioner.

Mr. Soumitra Bandyopadhyay, Sr. Govt. Adv.
Mr. Srinath Singha Roy

...for the State.

1. The writ petitioner and the respondent/State and its functionaries are represented by their respective learned advocates.
2. At the time of hearing, Mr. Ray, learned advocate appearing on behalf of the writ petitioner at the very outset draws attention of this Court to Page No. 44 of the instant writ petition, being a copy of the representation of the writ petitioner dated 11.03.2025 as submitted with the respondent no. 3/authority.
3. It is submitted by Mr. Ray that despite submission of such representation, the respondent no. 3/authority sat tight over the matter and practically did nothing.
4. It is further submitted by Mr. Ray that under cover of the said representation, it has been urged by the writ petitioner to the respondent no. 3/authority that the property as has been mentioned in the first paragraph of the said representation was involved in acquisition, however, in such acquisition no compensation has been disbursed and the land remained unutilized.

5. Such contention is, however, disputed by Mr. Bandyopadhyay, learned senior government advocate appearing on behalf of the State by saying that the present writ petitioner is a post acquisition purchaser.
6. After careful consideration of the entire materials as placed before this Court and after hearing the learned advocates for the contending parties, this Court while disposing the instant writ petition directs the respondent no. 3/authority to consider the representation of the writ petitioner dated 11.03.2025 in accordance with law and after giving an opportunity of hearing to the writ petitioner and/or his authorized representative shall pass a reasoned order and forthwith communicate the same to the writ petitioner preferably by mail, if the email details of the writ petitioner is given to him at the time of hearing.
7. The entire exercise as indicated hereinabove is to be completed within 60 working days from the date of communication of this order.
8. The time limit as fixed by this Court is mandatory and peremptory.
9. Liberty is given to the learned advocate for the writ petitioner to communicate the server copy of this order to the respondent no. 3/authority forthwith.
10. The respondent no. 3/authority is directed to act on the server copy of this order.
11. Before parting with, it is, however, made it clear that this Court has not entered into the merits of the instant writ petition and thus, all points are kept open.

12. With the aforementioned observations, the instant writ petition being **WPA 11460 of 2025** is disposed of.
13. Before parting with, it is further made it clear that in the event, the respondent no. 3/authority finds sufficient justification in the representation of the writ petitioner, he is directed to take appropriate steps in accordance with law.

(Partha Sarathi Sen, J.)