

24.11.2025
Item No.09
Ct. No.1
PG

W.P.A.(P) 474 of 2025

**Rajib Kumar Acharyya
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Tapas Kr. Sinha
Mr. Debasis Sur
Mr. Rejaul Alam
Mr. Banshi Badan Maity
Mr. Dipam Mazumder
.....for the petitioner

Mr. Lalit Mohan Mahata
Mr. Rajendra Chaturvedi
Mr. Saikat Senfor the State

Mr. Siddhartha Sarkar
Mr. Mansaram Ram Mondal
Mr. Sourav Gupta.....for the Respondent Nos.8 & 9

PER SUJOY PAUL, ACJ:

1. Parties are represented through their respective learned counsel.
2. Learned counsel for petitioner, at the outset, fairly submits that petitioner preferred several representations mainly highlighting two aspects. **Firstly**, in relation to conversion and **secondly**, in relation to missing of a river pump, which used to supply water to a huge area.
3. It is informed that Case No. 13 of 2025 is decided by learned Additional District Magistrate and District Land and Land Reforms Officer, Purba Medinipur on 02.09.2025. To this extent, petitioner's grievance stood redressed. However,

the said authority has not considered about the aspect of missing of river pump.

4. During the course of hearing, learned counsel for the parties agreed that petitioner may be given liberty to file a fresh representation confined to the points of missing of river pump as well as pipelines for each and every corner of the landed properties in the relevant area and regarding receiving the benefits from Krishak Bandhu Scheme and PM Kishan Samman Nidhi as well as other Government facilities by the Jhill related persons. It is agreed that if such representation is preferred, the respondent no. 2 may be directed to decide the representation within stipulated time.
5. In view of consensus arrived at, the PIL is disposed of by permitting the petitioner to file a fresh representation relating to the said aspects and file it before the respondent no. 2 along with copy of this order. In turn, the respondent no. 2 shall consider and decide the representation in accordance with law within 90 days therefrom.
6. It will be open to the respondent no. 2 to hear any other party, who is going to be affected by his order.
7. The PIL stands disposed of without expressing any opinion on merits. It is also made clear that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the

legality and correctness of order dated 2.09.2025, passed by Additional District Magistrate and District Land and Land Reforms Officer, Purba Medinipur being the respondent no. 3.

8. Mr. Mahata, learned Additional Government Pleader undertakes to communicate this order to the respondent no. 2 forthwith.
9. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be furnished to the parties expeditiously upon compliance of all legal formalities.

(SUJOY PAUL, ACJ.)

(PARTHA SARATHI SEN, J.)