

22.12.2025
Sl. No.16
tkm

W.P.A. 28372 of 2025

Krishanu Ghosh
-Vs-
State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. S P Dalapati
Mr. Y Ropy
Ms. Sabera Khatun
Ms. A Najrin
Ms. K Khatoon
... .. for the petitioner
Mr. Sirsanya Bandopadhyay
Mr. S Adak
... .. for WBIDCL
Ms. Jhuma Chakraborty
Mr. Hare Krishna Halder
... .. for the State

1. Affidavit of service as well as supplementary affidavit filed by the petitioner is taken on record.
2. The petitioner has applied for allotment of a land for setting up of a factory. The respondent authority has received an application and it was shown in the portal that it is in process. Thereafter, on 11.4.2025 the authority directed the petitioner to submit certain details. Accordingly, on receipt of the said letter from the authorities, the petitioner has submitted the entire details to the authorities.
3. In spite of receipt of the details, the respondents did not inform the petitioner with regard to the status whether the case of the petitioner is considered or not.

4. The petitioner has made representations, but no reply has been sent. The petitioner has also filed an application under the Right to Information Act which was duly forwarded to the Executive Director and West Bengal Industrial Development Corporation (WBIDC) but inspite of the same no communication has been made to the petitioner and the petitioner has filed the present writ petition.

5. The petitioner has filed a supplementary affidavit by disclosing a letter dated 6th August 2025 and submits that from the said letter it reveals that WBIDC has allotted the plot measuring 2.89 hector (plot I-2) at Vidyasagar Industrial Park, but the authorities are not given any reply to the application submitted by the petitioner.

6. Learned counsel for the respondent submits that on receipt of the application, what are the documents required to be furnished by the petitioner, the same was informed to the petitioner and the petitioner has submitted all the documents.

7. Considering the documents submitted by the petitioner along with the persons who have applied for allotment of the land for establishment of factory, the same has been considered and the request of the petitioner has been rejected.

8. This court does not find any communication by the authorities that the request of the petitioner

has been rejected. This court finds that the petitioner has made representations to the authorities but the authorities did not reply to the same.

9. Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of by directing the respondent no. 4 (Executive Director) to consider the case of the petitioner and to pass a reasoned and speaking order within one week from the date of receipt of this order and to communicate the same to the petitioner.

(Krishna Rao, J.)