

S/L 27  
27.10.2025  
Court. No. 19  
*Suwayan*

**WPA 13174 of 2012**

**Kishore Routh  
Vs.  
The Union of India & Ors.**

*Mr. Bhagbat Chaudhuri  
Ms. Gopa Moinan*

*...for the petitioner.*

1. On behalf of the writ petitioner a receipt dated 28.07.2025 showing deposit of cost and an affidavit-in-reply against the affidavit-in-opposition of the respondent nos. 1 to 8 is filed. Let those be taken on record.
2. None appears on behalf of the respondents/railway authorities and no affidavit-in-opposition is also filed.
3. On behalf of the respondents/authorities no accommodation has also been prayed for.
4. Accordingly, the instant writ petition is taken up for hearing.
5. On careful consideration of the entire materials as placed before this Court and after hearing the learned Advocate for the writ petitioner it reveals that it is the grievance of the writ petitioner that his representation dated 12.06.2012 as submitted on his behalf by his learned Advocate to the respondents/authorities have not been considered as yet.
6. On further careful consideration of the entire materials it appears from page no. 61 of the instant writ petition that the railway authorities had already taken possession of the Unit no. 1, Stall no. 1 which was run

by one Mohan Routh (since deceased) the father of the writ petitioner. From the said memo dated 22.06.2011 it further reveals that the railway authorities directed the original licensee to submit certain documents including life certificate of the licensee.

7. From the submission of learned Advocate for the writ petitioner as well as from the pleadings of the instant writ petition it reveals that the original licensee Mohan Routh passed away on 09.10.2004.
8. On perusal of page no. 70 of the instant writ petition it reveals that Station Manager, Chuchura, Eastern Railway issued a memo in favour of the In-Charge of RPF Post, Bandel to deploy sufficient number of armed personnel for vacating the relevant vending stall at Chuchura Station.
9. On perusal of the copy of the representation dated 12.06.2012 as available at page nos. 71 to 75 it reveals that under cover of such representation the writ petitioner approaches the respondents/authorities more specifically the railway authorities to grant license in favour of him instead of his deceased father in respect of the self same vending stall. In the said representation the writ petitioner has also averred that time to time he has made payment to the railway authorities towards license fee for such vending stall.
10. In course of hearing, learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the writ petitioner could not substantiate by producing any document and/or any other material that the vending license as has been issued in the name

of Mohan Routh is transferrable and/or heritable in nature. No material has also been placed before this Court to substantiate that after the death of the said Mohan Routh the present writ petitioner has deposited the license fees with the railway authorities for continuation of the business of vending.

11. Such being the position, this Court finds no justification to interfere with the alleged action and/or non-action or inaction on the part of the railway authorities.
12. With the aforementioned observation, WPA 13174 of 2012 is dismissed.
13. However, there shall be no order as to costs.
14. Urgent Xerox certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance of all necessary formalities.

**(Partha Sarathi Sen, J.)**