

36
20.11.2025
sb
Ct.3.

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE

WPA 24711 of 2025

Radha Nath Nandy
Versus
Kolkata Municipal Corporation & Ors.

Mr. Radha Nath Nandy
... petitioner-in-person.

1. The instant writ petition has been filed for cancellation of a sanctioned building plan for construction of an eight storied building at premises no.7B, Kavi Sukanta Sarani, Narkeldanga, Kolkata.
2. The petitioner also asserts ownership, possession and title to the extent of 1/10th portion of the land in respect of 7B, Kavi Sukanta Sarani (formerly 7B Charakdanga Road) under P.S. Narkeldanga, Kolkata – 700 085.
3. The petitioner appears in person and would submit that a building plan has been sanctioned by Kolkata Municipal Corporation in favour of the private respondents on the strength of a development agreement.
4. It is the petitioner's case that though the petitioner has been recognized as an owner in the development agreement, the petitioner is, however, not the signatory to the same. The petitioner claims that the petitioner has received a token amount of Rs.5000/- for the purpose of execution of the aforesaid development

agreement. According to him, Rs.5000/- is not adequate. Though the averments made in the petition are not clear what this Court has gathered is that the petitioner, in effect, seeks cancellation of the sanctioned building plan though no particulars thereof has been disclosed. I find that the petitioner has not taken any steps for revocation of the sanction plan and simpliciter has approached this Court in peculiar sets of facts. Upon going through the petition it also transpires that the petitioner is attempting to seek declaration of title as well. The petitioner is also aggrieved by the action on the part of the respondent nos. 3 and 4 and claims that Parcha (record of rights) was snatched from the petitioner on 17th January, 2025 and an FIR in this regard has also been lodged.

5. In the above facts and circumstances, I am of the view that the above issues cannot be conveniently decided before this Hon'ble Court in exercise of its extra-ordinary jurisdiction. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

6. The aforesaid order shall not stand in the way of the petitioner to enforce his other rights, if any, before appropriate forum, if so advised.

7. There shall be no order as to costs.

(Raja Basu Chowdhury, J.)