

17.11.2025
22
sdas

WPA 30578 of 2024

Devabrata Banerjee
Vs.
Union of India & Ors.

Mr. Avirup Mondal
Ms. Shreyasi Maity
.... for the petitioner

Ms. Amrita Pandey
Mr. Supratim Ghosh
..... for the UOI

Mr. Aman Aggarwal
Mr. Debabrata Das
Mr. A. Sarkar
Mr. Pratik Acharjee
..... for the respondent no. 2

Ms. Parna Roy Choudhury
..... for the PNB

Mr. Victor Dutta
..... for the respondent no. 7

1. Let affidavit-of-service as filed in Court be kept on record.
2. Since nobody appears on behalf of the respondent no. 1/Union of India, Ms. Pandey, learned Advocate, who usually appears on behalf of the Union of India and is present in Court, is requested to appear on behalf of the Union of India. Let her appointment be regularized.
3. The petitioner's grievance is that the application of the petitioner under the "Pradhan Mantri Awas

Yojona” scheme (hereinafter referred to as the “said scheme”) for grant of interest subsidy facilities was never considered by the respondent no. 3.

4. Respondent no. 3 had dealt with the representation made by the petitioner sometime in July 17, 2017, stating in no uncertain terms, the petitioner had never applied for the said scheme at all. Hence, the question of considering his application never arose.
5. Even though the petitioner alleges that he was made to sign certain documents, which he thought, were applications under the said scheme, no such document or any application could be produced nor annexed to the writ petition.
6. Ms. Pandey, learned Advocate appearing for the Union of India, states that the aforementioned scheme has lapsed on March 31, 2024.
7. However, Ms. Pandey, also submits that there is a fresh scheme, at present, being the “Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana Urban 2.0”. Application to avail the benefits under that scheme has lapsed sometime in September 30, 2025. The petitioner has not applied under such scheme either. He has also not challenged the order of the bank of July 17, 2017.

8. In view of the aforestated, the writ petition must fail.
9. The instant writ petition is, thus, dismissed.
10. There shall, however, be no order as to costs.
11. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties on usual undertaking.

(Reetobroto Kumar Mitra, J.)