

Sl. 17
04.12.2025
Court No.19
BP

WPA 22006 of 2025

Imran Ahmed & Anr.
-versus-
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Partha Pratim Roy
Mr. Samrat Chakraborty
..for the petitioners

Mr. Ayan Banerjee
Mr. Ajeyo Chowdhury
..for the State

The petitioners claim to be the owners of R.S. Dag No. 3413 within Mouza Kamrabad, J.L. No. 41 under Police Station Sonarpur in the District of 24 Parganas (South). The petitioners state that though R.S. Plot No. 3413 was the subject matter of acquisition but the same was subsequently released from acquisition. The petitioners submitted a representation dated August 29, 2025 before various authorities including the Assistant Land Acquisition Officer, 24 Parganas (South) praying for relinquishing the shali land of the petitioners being R.S. Dag No. 3413 corresponding to L.R. Dag No. 3416 within Mouza Kamrabad.

The grievance of the petitioners is that no decision was communicated to the petitioners on such representation. The petitioners have approached this Court seeking a writ of mandamus directing the respondent authorities to declare that the plot of land

purchased by the petitioners is not the subject matter of any acquisition proceeding.

Mr. Roy, learned advocate appearing for the petitioners places reliance upon an information supplied under the provisions of the Right to Information Act communicated to the petitioners by a memo dated April 11, 2025 in support of his contention that R.S. Plot No. 3413 was later on withdrawn from the acquisition vide notification dated 5th April, 1971.

Mr. Banerjee, learned advocate appears for the State. He does not dispute the fact that R.S. Plot No. 3413 was withdrawn for acquisition. He submits that the petitioners have not produced any document in support of his contention that they are the owners of R.S. Plot No. 3413.

Faced with such situation, Mr. Roy, learned advocate appearing for the petitioners sought for time to take instruction from his client.

Today (04.12.2025) Mr. Roy, learned advocate appearing for the petitioners submits that the writ petitioners purchased a portion of R.S. Dag No. 3410 and not R.S. Dag No. 3413.

On a query of the Court Mr. Roy, learned advocate for the petitioners does not dispute the fact that R.S. Dag No. 3410 was the subject matter of acquisition but could not produce any document to show that the said plot was withdrawn from acquisition. Thus this Court is not

inclined to allow the prayer of the petitioners praying for release of the land of the petitioners and for a declaration that the property of the petitioners is not subject matter of any acquisition. However, this Court cannot shut its eyes to the false representation made by the petitioners before the authorities. In the representation dated 29th August, 2025 the writ petitioners have prayed for relinquishment of the shali land being R.S. Dag No. 3413 corresponding to L.R. Dag No. 3416. In the said representation the petitioners sought to create an impression that they have purchased R.S. Plot No. 3413 which would be further evident from the fact that the informations supplied under the provisions of the Right to Information Act with regard to withdrawal of R.S. Plot No. 3413 from acquisition was specifically stated therein. A typed copy of the deed of conveyance has been annexed to this writ petition and in the schedule of the said deed the R.S. Dag number has been mentioned as “341.....”. However, for the recitals of the said deed it appears that there is a reference of Dag No. 3410 though it has been typed as “P.S. Dag No. 3410”. However from the registration details annexed at page 43 of the writ petition it appears that the subject matter of the registered deed of conveyance was L.R. Dag No. 3413. It is not in dispute that L.R. Dag No. 3413 corresponds to R.S. Dag No. 3410 and not R.S. Dag No. 3413.

After going through the materials on record this Court is of the considered view that the petitioners made a false representation in the letter dated 29th August, 2025 and have annexed typed documents with an object of creating an impression in the mind of the Court that the petitioners were the owners of R.S. Dag No. 3413. Thus the petitioners practised fraud upon the Court for which this Court is inclined to impose cost upon the petitioners.

For the reasons as aforesaid, WPA 22006 of 2025 stands dismissed with costs assessed at Rs. 20,000/-to be paid to the State Legal Services Authority, City Civil Court at Calcutta within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of a server copy of this order.

There shall be, however, no order as to costs.

Urgent certified photocopy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties expeditiously on compliance of usual legal formalities.

(Hiranmay Bhattacharyya, J.)