

<sup>7</sup>  
jdt. 17.12.2025  
jb.

**WPA 24658 of 2025**  
**(Lakshmi Oraon vs. State of West Bengal & Ors.)**

**Mr. Shibaji Kr. Das**  
**Mr. Dipendu Sarkar**  
**Ms. Deblina De**  
**Ms. M. Das**

.... For the Petitioner

**Mr. Pinaki Bhattacharjee**  
**Mr. Sujit Chatterjee**

.... For the State

Affidavit of service filed by the petitioner and the report submitted by the State are taken on record.

The petitioner is the councillor of ward no. 8, Kalyani Municipality, Nadia and was provided with personal security by the Superintendent of Police, Nadia from 2006 to February, 2023. She along with her associates detected taking of bribe by a civic volunteer attached to Kalyani police station and complained before the Superintendent of Police, Ranaghat Police District, Nadia. The complaint was not registered as FIR. On the contrary, the personal security of the petitioner was withdrawn. The petitioner seeks restoration of her personal security.

It appears from the report submitted by the State that the personal security was withdrawn pursuant to a periodical review of threat perception. Documents pertaining to such periodical review have not been annexed. The petitioner submitted a representation before the Superintendent of Police, Ranaghat Police District for restoration of her personal security. Such representation not being heeded to, she approached this Court in a writ petition. By an order passed on 18<sup>th</sup> August, 2025 in WPA

18680 of 2025 a co-ordinate Bench of this Court directed the Superintendent of Police to assess regarding the aspect of insecurity or threat perception of the petitioner and give necessary direction within a stipulated time frame. The petitioner's request was turned down by the Superintendent of Police by a one liner dated 27<sup>th</sup> August, 2025. Being aggrieved by the said order, the petitioner again approached this Court and by an order passed on 11<sup>th</sup> September, 2025 in WPA 21173 of 2025, this Court directed the Superintendent of Police to revisit his earlier order upon granting reasonable opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. The petitioner was granted liberty to produce all the documents in her custody. Surprisingly a notice of hearing was issued upon the petitioner by the Deputy Superintendent of Police, Ranaghat Police District on 18<sup>th</sup> September, 2025. The Deputy Superintendent of Police heard the petitioner who submitted a representation annexing all relevant documents. However, the final order of rejection was passed by the Superintendent of Police on 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2025.

Since this Court specifically directed the Superintendent of Police to revisit his earlier order, the Deputy Superintendent of Police had no authority to either issue notice upon the petitioner in this regard or hear her submission and consider her documents. The Superintendent of Police could not have delegated such authority to the Deputy Superintendent of Police despite order of this Court. This amounts to clear violation of the Court's order. Also, the Superintendent of Police has

acknowledged registration of several FIRs on the basis of complaints lodged by the petitioner due to attacks on her. However, her security was withdrawn. The last complaint was in fact lodged on 25<sup>th</sup> October, 2025 and FIR registered on the same date. Therefore there is no denial of the fact that the petitioner has faced several attacks after her security was withdrawn and there is sufficient apprehension of threat of her life and limb.

In view of the above, the order passed by the Superintendent of Police on 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2025 in violation of the order of this Court is set aside.

This Court directs the Superintendent of Police to reconsider restoration of personal security in favour of the petitioner upon consideration of the documents filed by the petitioner and providing her an opportunity of hearing, in the light of the observation made in this order.

The writ petition is accordingly disposed of.

There shall be no order as to costs.

Since no affidavit has been invited, allegations contained in the writ petition shall be deemed not to have been admitted.

Urgent certified website copy of the order, if applied for, be given to the parties on compliance of requisite formalities.

**(Suvra Ghosh, J.)**