

13.02.2025
Item No.12
RP/SM
Ct. No.01

WPA(P) 519 of 2024
Biplab Kumar Chowdhury
Vs.
State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Anindya Halder, Adv.

....For the Petitioner

Mr. Amales Ray, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Mousumi Bhowal, Adv.
Mr. Aman Gupta, Adv.

....For the Respondent
Nos.8 to 11

Mr. Sandip Ghosh, Adv.
Mr. Sudarsan Roy, Adv.

....For the North Dum Dum
Municipality

Mr. Lalit Mohan Mahata, A.G.P.
Mr. Prasanta Behari Mahata, Adv.

....For the State

1. The petitioner claims to be a public spirited person. It is an undisputed fact that the petitioner is a habitual litigant and he filed more than 195 cases before this Court and the Division Bench also had an occasion to deal with one of his matters and the same was dismissed with cost of Rs.50,000/-. In another writ petition being WPA 3116 of 2022 the Court dismissed the writ petition filed by the recent petitioner by order dated 22nd September, 2022, imposing a cost of Rs.25,000/- after taking note of the submission that the petitioner has habit of filing writ petition one after other to put pressure upon the private parties and to extort money from them and that the writ petition was filed with vested interest for his personal gain. The petitioner on earlier occasion came up with an identical prayer in

WPA 5961 of 2020. In the said case, the petitioner did not appear.

2. The learned advocate for the Municipal Corporation appeared and had filed a report in the form of affidavit denying all the allegations. However, since the petitioner did not appear, the Division Bench while disposing of the writ petition left it open for the petitioner to approach the Secretary, Urban Development Department and Municipal Affairs Department, Government of West Bengal by way of appropriate representation. The petitioner stated to have given representation on 19th August, 2024, to the Secretary, Urban Development Department and Municipal Affairs Department, Government of West Bengal and has come forward with this writ petition. The learned advocate appearing for the Municipal Corporation has rightly pointed out that the person who said to have put up the illegal construction or encroached upon a water body, neither has been mentioned nor has been made a party. In any event, the petitioner appears to be a busy body and it is stated that 50 writ petitions filed by the recent petitioners are pending before this Court and included in the Monthly Cause List.
3. Thus, the Court is not satisfied with the bona fide of the writ petitioner and, therefore, is not inclined to grant

any relief in this writ petition. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

(T.S SIVAGNANAM)
CHIEF JUSTICE

(BIVAS PATTANAYAK, J.)