

24.09.2025

Sl.No. 11
Ct.No. 23
Amalranjan

In The High Court At Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

WPA 12705 of 2025

Liyakat Hossain Mondal
Vs.
The State of West Bengal and ors.

Mr. Mahammad Mahmud
...for the petitioner
Mr. Biswabrata Basu Mallick
Mr. Sayan Ganguly
...for the State respondents

1. Affidavit of service, filed by the petitioner in court, is taken on record.
2. The petitioner has filed this writ petition seeking direction upon the respondents, particularly the respondent nos. 3 to 5 to take immediate steps on the representation of the petitioner dated 30.04.2024 and take further steps to initiate appropriate action against the private respondents.
3. It is a specific case of the Petitioner that on the basis of forged registered deed, the names of the private respondents were recorded in ROR in collusion with the Block Land and Land Reforms Officer, Polba – Dadpur. The petitioner's father Bhasaram Mondal and Anjan Bibi were the owners of the land comprising L.R Plot No. 1022, Mouja Anti, J.L. no. 89, P.S.

Dadpur, District - Hooghly. They never transferred their land to any other person.

4. When Petitioner obtained certified copy of deed being no. 2151 for the year 1984, it was revealed that the deed was forged, executed by Arup Kumar Ghosh. After knowing the said facts, he made a representation before the respondent no. 4 praying to initiate appropriate action against the private respondents but no steps have been taken as yet.
5. Learned counsel representing the State raised question of the maintainability of the writ petition.
6. It apparently appears that the dispute is with regard to landed property and allegation of registration of forged deed which directly or indirectly involved the disputed question of facts.
7. The High Court in its exercise of writ jurisdiction usually refrains from entertaining a Writ, which involves adjudication of disputed questions of facts, which may require analysis of evidence of witnesses.
8. In the above back drop, nothing remains to be adjudicated in this writ petition.
9. The writ petition being **WPA 12705 of 2025** is, thus, **dismissed** without any order as to costs.

10. However, it is made clear that dismissal of this writ petition would not prevent the petitioner from approaching the appropriate forum for his grievances in accordance with law.

11. All parties shall act in terms of the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.

(Ajay Kumar Gupta, J.)