

08.07.2025
Sl. No. 09-10
Ct No. 3
SG

WPA 7581 of 2025

**Purnima Biswas
Vs
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

With

WPA 13506 of 2025

**Purnima Biswas
Vs
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Satrajit Sinha Roy.
... for the petitioner

Mr. Debjit Mukherjee,
Ms. Priyanka Jana.
... for the KMC

Mr. Sahabuddin Sardar,
Mr. Durga Bhusan Mukherjee.
... for the State
[in WPA 13506 of 2025]

1. The Petitioner, in the present writ petition, addressed a letter dated 22.05.2025 to the Hon'ble Chief Justice of the Calcutta High Court, wherein she stated that she is a widow and a senior citizen aged 65 years. She claims to be a co-owner of premises bearing No. 4/H/7, Roy Para Lane, P.S. Sinthee, Kolkata – 700050. She, along with other co-owners, entered into a development agreement with one Md. Salim and Shankar Das for the development of the

said premises. The Petitioner has further alleged that her estranged son-in-law, Mr. Tapan Roy @ Tapan Roy Paul, a resident of 33/61/2, Nabin Chandra Das Road, P.S. Baranagar, Kolkata – 700090, and currently residing at 5/1C, Hem Dey Lane, Kolkata – 700050, who is a practicing advocate with a chamber at Room No. 20E, 10, Old Post Office Street, Kolkata – 700001, has, without any legal authority or her consent, instituted multiple litigations in her name and on her behalf against the developers and tenants with ulterior motives. She has also alleged that said Mr. Tapan Roy physically assaulted her with fists, blows, and kicks, and coerced her into signing and filing various legal proceedings, including the instant writ petition being WPA 7581 of 2025. She contends that she never intended to initiate such proceedings and that her son-in-law exploited his position as an advocate to intimidate and unduly influence her into doing so. In light of the above, the Petitioner has requested that the writ petition be withdrawn or dismissed for non-prosecution.

2. In consideration of the said communication, this Court, by an order dated 02.07.2025, directed the learned Counsel for the Petitioner to produce the Petitioner before this Court on 08.07.2025.

3. Today, learned Counsel appearing for the Petitioner submits that he is unable to produce the Petitioner. Upon inquiry by the Court, learned Counsel stated that he does not have any instructions from the Petitioner and has been unable to establish contact with her.

4. In view of the contents of the Petitioner's letter addressed to the Hon'ble Chief Justice, the absence of any instructions to the learned Counsel representing her, and her failure to appear before this Court despite the specific direction dated 02.07.2025, this Court is left with no option but to conclude that the Petitioner is not interested in pursuing these petitions. Accordingly, the present writ petitions are dismissed for non-prosecution.

(Gaurang Kanth, J.)