

19/12
2025

12/24
266312
NANDY

(DISMISSED)

**In the High Court at Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side**

WPA 28464 of 2025

**SANJIMAN NISHA & ANR.
Vs.
THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL & ORS.**

Mr. Shaharyar Alam, Advocate
Mr. Saiful Alam, Advocate

.....for the Petitioners

Mr. Srijan Nayak, Advocate
Ms. Rituparna Maitra, Advocate

.....for the Cooperative Election Commission

Ms. Sipra Majumdar, Advocate
Mr. Naren Ghosh Dostidar, Advocate

.....for the State

Mr. Ankit Sureka, Advocate
Mr. Biplob Das, Advocate
Mr. Partha Sarathi Pal, Advocate

.....for the Respondent Nos. 8 & 9

1. The petitioners' grievance is that the authorities have not taken into account several of the issues raised by them. The petitioners along with two other persons had instituted a writ-petition being WPA 15423 of 2025 before this Hon'ble Court which was disposed of by an order of 29.07.2025 directing the Cooperative Election Commission to consider the representation of the petitioners and dispose of the same within a stipulated time.
2. In deference to such order of this Hon'ble Court, the Commission had conducted a hearing and disposed of the matter on 27.08.2025. That order has not been assailed in the present writ-petition. In fact, two of the petitioners in WPA 15423 of 2025, are presently on the Board of Directors of the Society. Obviously, those two persons have not joined in the present writ-petition.
3. The petitioners reiterate the very same grievance which had been made in WPA 15423 of 2025. These issues including the allegation that election had been conducted

behind their back without due notice to them and that the election of the Board of Directors had been held secretly without their knowledge, have all been duly addressed in the order of 27.08.2025, which the petitioners have not challenged.

4. The order clearly records that the notice was dispatched in accordance with the regulation of the West Bengal Cooperative Rules. In addition thereto, the notice was also affixed on the Board of the local Panchayat Office as well as published in a local newspaper.
5. Thus, the petitioners' grievance that the election had been held secretly without their knowledge is clearly baseless and unfounded.
6. The petitioners allege that the resolution was signed by dead persons and was, therefore, illegal. Such an issue had not been raised before the Commission nor is the present issue germane at this point of time since the election had already been held on 21.07.2025.
7. The petitioners' present assertion that some of the signatures on the Resolution had been obtained fraudulently as such persons expired long back, had never been urged by the petitioners in their representation and could not have been considered by the Secretary of the Commission.
8. The petitioners are indulging in multiplicity of proceedings and taking a new point on every occasion to approach this Hon'ble Court. The intention of the petitioners are suspicious and do not evoke any confidence. The Secretary has duly dealt with all points raised by the petitioners in their representation.
9. In view of the afore-stated, **WPA 28464 of 2025 is dismissed.** No order as to costs.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)

