

12th August, 2025

Item no. DL 55
Court No. 08

Asraf, A.R.(Ct.)

In the High Court at Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

Case No. **WPA(P) 312 of 2025**

In the matter of :

ASHOK GHOSH

....Petitioner

VS.

THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL & ORS.

....Respondents

For the Petitioner :

Ms. Ipsita Ghosh

....Advocate

For the Respondents / State :

Mr. Nilotpal Chatterjee

Mr. Gourav Das

....Advocates

1. Affidavit of service filed in Court is taken on record.
2. The instant writ petition is in the nature of a public interest litigation claiming, inter alia, following reliefs :-

“a) A writ of and/or order in the nature of Mandamus do issue, directing the respondent authorities in particular the respondent nos.2 being the District Controller of Food and Supplies, Hooghly, to sanction and operationalize a new Ration Shop or a second counter at Khamrupara (Nayasarai Mouja), centrally located to serve the villages of Sherpur, Ramnagar, and Shimulia, with over 700 ration card holders forthwith;

b) A writ of and/or order in the nature of Mandamus do issue, directing the respondent authorities in particular the respondent no.2 being the District Controller of Food and Supplies, Hooghly, complete the administrative process

*forthwith, especially in view of the earlier assurance given in 2020 and representations submitted by the villagers being Annexure 'P/2', 'P/3' and 'P/4';
... .."*

3. The petitioner's main grievance is with regard to the shifting of a ration shop to a distant location in Phulpukur, making it unsafe and difficult for villagers, especially for the elderly, women and disabled to access food grains. Despite repeated representations from 2020 to 2025 before the concerned authority, till date no action has been taken from the end of the authority concerned.
4. Since the issue is pending for a considerable period of time and for the interest of public at large, the writ petition / PIL is disposed of with the direction upon the petitioner along with other villagers to submit a fresh comprehensive representation before the respondent no.2 within a fortnight. The respondent no.2 shall consider the representation and pass a reasoned order in accordance with law within a period of two months after affording opportunity of hearing to all the concerned parties.
5. However, it is made clear that the Court has not gone into the merits of the case.

(Sujoy Paul, J.)

(Smita Das De, J.)