

*Dd* 3 08.08.2025

**RVW/229/2025**  
**SMT MANISHA DAS**  
**VS**  
**THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL AND ORS.**  
**IA NO: CAN/1/2025**  
**in**  
**WPLRT/82/2024**  
**SMT MANISHA DAS**  
**VS**  
**THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL AND ORS.**

Mr. M.A. Samad, Advocate  
... .. For the Appellant

Mr. Swapan Banerjee,  
Ms. Soumita Shaw,  
Mr. Soumen Chatterjee, Advocates

1. Review applicant seeks review of the judgment and order dated July 2, 2025.
2. Learned advocate appearing for the review applicant draws the attention of the Court to the paragraphs 8 and 9 of the judgment and order under review.
3. He submits that the review applicant is seeking to assail LR Record of Rights and not the RS Record of Rights. Consequently, the finding of the High Court that, the review applicant is a post vesting transferee is incorrect. Moreover, the decree passed in the civil suit is binding upon the State. The finding to the contrary recorded in paragraph 9 of the impugned judgment and order is incorrect.
4. State is represented.
5. In response to the query of the Court as to when the RS Record of Rights was published and when the review applicant purchased the property, learned advocate for the review applicant submits

that, the RS Record of Rights was published in 1979 and that the review applicant purchased the immovable property in February 28, 1983.

6. State undertook a revision under Section 14T(3) of the West Bengal Land Reforms Act, 1955. In such proceedings, State found a substantial portion of the land of the big raiyat to be vested.
7. The RS Record of Rights was published in 1979. RS Record of Rights demonstrates property which stands vested.
8. Review applicant is claiming title through the big raiyat. The plot concerned stood vested with the State under the RS Record of Rights.
9. No doubt, there is a civil suit between the private parties in which such civil suit, initially the State was party defendant. At the behest of the plaintiff in such suit, State was deleted as a party defendant from such suit. Therefore, in our understanding decree passed in such civil suit cannot be said to be binding upon the State as the State was not a party defendant when the decree was passed in such civil suit.
10. Consequently, we find no ground to interfere in the present review application.
11. RVW/229/2025 along with the connected application are **disposed of** without any order as to costs.

**(Debangsu Basak, J.)**

**(Prasenjit Biswas, J.)**