

WPA 30273 of 2024

Guru Pada Natua
Vs.
The State of W.B. & Ors.

Mr. Ranajit Roy
Md. Shakeel Khan
Ms. Rinki Saha
Mr. Jane Alam ...for the petitioner.

Mr. Ashim Kr. Ganguly
Mr. Tarak Karan ...for the State.

Report submitted by the State is taken on record.

Heard learned counsels for the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the 4th respondent who is the petitioner's son is continuously torturing and assaulting the petitioner and trying to take control over the paddy warehouse owned and run by the petitioner. The said warehouse is his only source of livelihood.

It appears from the report submitted by the State that the paddy warehouse is owned by the petitioner. The complaint lodged by the petitioner has been registered as FIR and a specific case initiated. Investigation is in progress.

The police authority is directed to conduct fair, unbiased and impartial investigation and take the same to its logical conclusion in accordance with law.

Since the petitioner alleges that the private respondent and his wife have taken possession of the paddy warehouse during pendency of the writ petition, the petitioner is at liberty to approach the appropriate forum for redressal of his grievance.

In the meantime, the police authority is directed to keep strict vigil over the area in order to ensure that no untoward incident occurs and shall render adequate protection/assistance to the petitioner as and when required.

With the above observation and directions, the writ petition is disposed of.

There shall, however, be no order as to costs.

Since no affidavit is invited, the allegations contained in the writ petition are deemed not to have been admitted.

Urgent certified website copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance with all requisite formalities.

(Suvra Ghosh, J.)