

27th August,2025
Item no.D/L 16
Court No. 14
Pradip, A.R.(Ct.)

In the High Court at Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

Case No. **WPA 16843 of 2024**

In the matter of :
M/S Sneha Marketing and Management Services
.... Petitioner
VS.
State of West Bengal & Ors.
....Respondents

For the Petitioner:
Mr. Moyukh Mukherjee
Ms. Sagnika Banerjee
Mr. Sanat Mondal
....Advocates

For the State:
Mr. Jayanta Samanta
Mr. Kushal Biswas
Mr. Soumava Santra
....Advocates

For the Respondent nos. 3 &4:
Mr. Arijit Basu
....Advocate

For the Respondent no. 5:
Mr. Kamal Kumar Chattopadhyay
Ms. Rimi Chatterjee
Mr. Tanjir Ali
....Advocates

1. The petitioner challenges the order of ban passed by the respondent no. 4 on 23rd September, 2023 effective from 3rd August, 2023 to 29th August, 2024. The period of ban is long over. The petitioner prays for compensation for the loss of work.
2. The petitioner is also aggrieved by the penalty deducted.

3. Learned advocates representing the respondents raises a preliminary objection with regard to the maintainability of the writ petition before this Court.
4. It has been submitted that this Court does not have the territorial jurisdiction to decide the issue. It has been submitted that the entire cause of action arose within the State of Jharkhand.
5. Learned advocate representing the petitioner submits that as the Head Office of the Steel Authority of India Limited, (Eastern Region) falls within the jurisdiction of this Court, accordingly, the writ petition will be maintainable.
6. The Court is not agreeable to accept the submission made by the petitioner as regards territorial jurisdiction of this Court to entertain the writ petition.
7. It appears that the ban order was passed by the Bokaro Steel Plant located in the State of Jharkhand. The penalty order also was issued outside the territorial jurisdiction of this Court.
8. Only because of the reason that the Regional Head Office of the Steel Authority of India Limited, (Eastern Region) is located within the jurisdiction of this Court, the writ petition cannot be entertained. The integral part of the cause of action arose outside the jurisdiction of this Court.
9. The Court is, accordingly, not inclined to entertain the writ petition and hence is not discussing anything on merits of the writ petition.

10. In view of the above, no relief can be granted to the petitioner in the instant writ petition. The writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.
11. Dismissal of the writ petition will not, however, stand in the way of the petitioner to approach the competent Court for relief in accordance with law, if so advised.
12. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)