

17 **28.03.
2025**

Ct. No. 28

Ab

WPA 26660 of 2024

Sakhatullah

Vs.

The State of West Bengal and others.

Mr. Md. Bani Israil.

... for the writ petitioner.

Mr. Sirsanya Bandopadhyay. Ld. SSC,

Mr. Ritesh Kumar Ganguly.

... for the State respondents.

The affidavit of service accompanying a copy of the notice has been handed up to the Court by the writ petitioner evincing service in terms of the last date's direction. The same is taken on record.

The respondents are represented.

The writ petitioner is aggrieved by non-consideration of his representation by the respondent no. 4 to issue No Objection in terms of the Drug Rules, 1945.

It appears that the writ petitioner has made a representation to the said authority on August 20, 2024 requesting the said authority to accord/sanction or provide "No Objection" for the purpose of issuance of fresh licence in favour of the writ petitioner.

It is the writ petitioner's case that he has been entangled in civil litigation and as such he could not make application for renewal of the drug licence within the specified time and the said licence lapsed.

In view of the fact that the representation made by the writ petitioner on August 20, 2024 has not yet been disposed of, the respondent no. 4 is directed to dispose of the said representation by a reasoned order within four weeks from the date of communication of this order.

It is clarified that this order should not be read to mean a direction upon the respondent no. 4 to grant licence or renew licence in favour of the writ petitioner.

The respondent no. 4 shall be free to take a decision strictly in accordance with law as to whether a licence should or should not be granted to the writ petitioner.

With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition is disposed of.

There shall be no order as to costs.

(Om Narayan Rai, J.)