

29-10-2025
Item No.14
Subrata
Bhattacharyya
AR(C)

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

WPA No.23494 of 2024
Riya Sarkar
-vs-
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

None	...for the petitioner
Ms. Sreemoyee Mitra	...for Canara Bank

1. None represents the petitioner. However, Canara Bank is represented.
2. On a perusal of the averments made in the writ petition, it appears that the petitioner apprehends that the authorities may hatch out some malicious plan and take action for raising objection to the constructions and running her business, and that the respondents may try to pull down or demolish the construction made by her.
3. On a further perusal of the prayer of the writ petition, it appears that the prayer has been made to direct the respondents to release the baby of the petitioner.
4. There is nothing on record to suggest that the baby of the petitioner has been taken away by any of the respondent-authorities. The facts of the case and the prayer made therein do not match with each other. The writ petition appears to be an utterly misconceived one.
5. Hence, the writ petition fails and is hereby dismissed.

6. Communication made by the learned counsel for the petitioner to the learned counsel for Canara Bank intimating that she is no longer appearing in this case handed over in Court by the learned counsel for the bank be retained with the records.
7. All parties are to act on the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.
8. Certified copy of this order, if applied for, shall be made available to the parties.

[Amrita Sinha, J]