

S/L 01
07.08.2025
Court No.14
PRADIP

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CIRCUIT BENCH AT JALPAIGURI
SPECIAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

CPAN 5 of 2025
In
WPA 2073 of 2024

Ratan Chandra Das
Vs.
Dr. Manoj Kumar Golder

Mr. Bhaskar Roy Mahashya

... for the Petitioner.

1. None represents the contemnor.
2. Learned advocate for the petitioner asserts that the order passed by the Court has not been complied with.
3. It has been submitted that the spot inspection was conducted without providing any prior notice to the petitioner.
4. The spot inspection report is annexed to the contempt application. It appears therefrom that the spot inspection was conducted in the presence of the petitioner. The authority opined that the plot of the petitioner has not been used for construction of the boundary wall.
5. Learned advocate for the petitioner submits that the private land of the petitioner has been used for construction of the boundary wall.
6. It appears that there are several disputed questions of facts which cannot be ascertained and decided in the contempt jurisdiction.
7. If the petitioner is still aggrieved by the act of the authorities, it will be open for the petitioner to approach

the competent forum, for redressal of his grievance, if so advised.

8. The contempt application stands disposed of.
9. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Amrita Sinha, J.)