

D/L 11
12.11.2025
Rohit
ct.no.25

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE**

WPA 22291 of 2024

**Calutta Veneer Industries Pvt. Ltd
Versus
The State of West Bengal & Ors**

Mr. Srijib Chakraborty
Mr. Subhasis Chakraborty
Mr. Sunny Nandy
Ms. Sushmita Kumari Singh
Mr. Amit Chowdhury

...for the Petitioner

Mr. Asish Kr. Guha, A.G.P
Mr. Tarak Karan

...for the State

1. The petitioner has filed the present writ application praying for an order for recalling of the impugned cancellation notification dated 27th December, 2016 as well as the impugned order dated 18th July, 2024 passed by the Appellate authority by rejecting the request of the petitioner for renewal of the sawmill license under general category.
2. Today when the matter is taken up for hearing, the learned Counsel for the petitioner has argued the matter at length. Learned Counsel for the state respondents has drawn the attention of this Court to the

order dated 13th August, 2025 which reads as follows:-

- 1. Order dated July 18, 2025 passed by the Appellate Authority, WBI, Nadia-Murshidabad District & Conservator of Forests & Joint Director, Sunderban Biosphere Reserve (Annexure P15, p.94) is impugned in the instant writ petition.***
- 2. It surfaces therefrom that the licence of the petitioner stood cancelled by the authority on December 27, 2016. The petitioner intends to obtain a fresh licence.***
- 3. Submission is that an application for fresh licence was made, but the same has inadvertently not been annexed to the writ petition. Leave has been sought to file a supplementary affidavit annexing the documents in support of the submission that an application for fresh licence is pending consideration.***
- 4. The aforesaid submission of the petitioner has been vehemently opposed by the learned counsel for the State. It has been submitted that in the entire writ petition there is no mention about the pendency of such application seeking grant of fresh licence.***

5. Be that as it may, leave sought for filing the supplementary affidavit stands allowed.

6. Let the supplementary affidavit be prepared and circulated by August 26, 2025.

7. Relist on August 29, 2025.

8. All parties are to act on the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.

9. Certified copy of this order, if applied for, shall be made available to the parties.”

3. By referring the said order, the learned Counsel for the state respondents submits that a submission was made before this Court on 18.08.2025 that the petitioner has made a fresh application for renewal of the license and accordingly on the submission made by the counsel for the petitioner, this Court has granted lieu to the petitioner to file supplementary affidavit.

4. The petitioner has filed the supplementary affidavit by disclosing the representation dated 19.10.2021 wherein the fact remains that in terms of the order passed by this Court on the previous round of litigation in

W.P.A 8544 of 2023 dated 29.02.2023 the Appellate authority had disposed of the earlier representation by rejecting the claim of the petitioner on 18.07.2024.

5. When the learned Counsel for the State has pointed out the said contradictory statement made by the petitioner and when this Court has made a query to the learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner with regard to the fresh representation in the supplementary affidavit as per the leave granted by this Court, the petitioner has relied upon the representation dated 10.10.2021. This Court finds that the representation dated 10.10.2021 has already been disposed by the competent authority by rejecting the claim of the petitioner. On 13.08.2025 when the matter is taken up for hearing by this Court, the petitioner has made incorrect submission and on the basis of the incorrect submission this Court has granted leave to the petitioner for filing supplementary affidavit disclosing the fresh representation. The petitioner has filed the supplementary affidavit disclosing old representation which has already been disposed of.

6. Considering the above this Court finds that now and then the petitioner is trying to mislead this Court to get a favourable order. There is no representation filed by the petitioner after the impugned order is passed by the Appellate authority on 18th July, 2024. This Court finds that this is a fit case wherein the writ petition is to be dismissed by imposing cost upon the petitioner. Accordingly, the writ petition is dismissed with the cost of Rs. 1,00,000/-. The petitioner is directed to pay the cost to the State Legal Service Authority within a period of one week from date.
7. Urgent Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance with all requisite formalities.

(Krishna Rao, J.)