

WPA(P)/526/2025

**SACHINDRA NATH NASKAR
VS.
STATE OF WEST BENGAL AND ORS.**

Mr. Sudarshan Ghosh, Adv.

...For the Petitioner

Mr. Jahar Lal De, A.G.P.

...For the State

Mr. Soumya Mukherjee, Adv.

...For the WBPCB

Mr. Chandra Nath Sarkar, Adv.

...For the Private Respondent

Per, Sujoy Paul, ACJ.

1. Affidavit-of-Service filed on behalf of the petitioner is taken on record.
2. Parties are represented through their respective learned counsel.
3. The singular grievance put forth by petitioner is that his representation dated 24th November, 2025, is not decided by West Bengal Pollution Control Board.
4. Shri De, learned Additional Government Pleader and Shri Sarkar, learned counsel for the private respondent urged that the number of chicks in the poultry farm are less than the requisite numbers for which the permission is required from the Pollution Control Board. In other words, it is submitted that if the number of chicks is beyond a particular number, then only said permission is required.

5. We repeatedly requested to learned counsel for the petitioner to apprise us as to whether in the present case such permission is required by referring to the relevant statute. Sadly no heed is paid by learned counsel for petitioner to prepare the matter in this regard. His repeated request is to issue a direction to decide his representation. The High Court is not acting as post office to send the representation from one office to another office with the direction to decide it. Unless a *prima facie* case is made out showing violation of any statutory provision, no interference can be made.
6. The interference is **declined**. Writ petition is **dismissed**.
7. However, liberty is reserved to file a properly constituted petition mentioning the relevant statutory provision.

(SUJOY PAUL, ACJ.)

(PARTHA SARATHI SEN, J.)