

09.06.2025
Sl. No.11
akd

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CIRCUIT BENCH AT JALPAIGURI

W. P. A. 1119 of 2025

[Saheb Ali -Vs- The State of West Bengal & Ors.]

Mr. Sayan Banerjee
Ms. Rishita Chakraborty
... .. for the petitioner

Mr. Nabankur Paul
Mr. Sourav Sarkar
... .. for the State

1. Affidavit-of-service filed in court today is taken on record.
2. The petitioner has preferred the present writ petition seeking direction upon the respondent authorities for disbursement of the outstanding amount of Rs.9,57,877/-, allegedly due and payable to him for the work executed towards the repair and renovation work of the primary schools under the jurisdiction of Matiali Development Block.
3. It is the case of the petitioner that he is a contractor who participated in a tender process. Pursuant to the tender, the Block Development Officer of Matiali Development Block, issued a work order dated 02.02.2022, for the repair and renovation work of primary schools in preparation for reopening under MB 2 GP, within the jurisdiction of Matiali Development Block. The petitioner further contended that the said work order was duly completed in accordance with the terms of the work order. Upon completion of the same, a completion certificate was issued by the concerned schools authorities in favour of the petitioner. Despite completion of

the said work and submission of the final bill, the concerned authority has not disbursed the legitimate claim of the petitioner. The petitioner further avers that although the total value of the work amounted to Rs. 9,82,384/-, only a payment of Rs. 24,507/- of the said amount has been released. The petitioner has preferred various representations to the respondent authorities for the disbursement of the dues remain unpaid. Despite repeated representations of the concerned authorities, the same has not been responded.

4. Learned Advocate for the State-respondents submits that the authorities have no objection to consider the petitioner's representation dated 26.12.2023.

5. In view of the submission made by the learned Advocate for the State-respondents, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that his client shall be satisfied if the representation dated 26.12.2023 is decided in a time bound manner by the competent authority.

6. Accordingly, this Court directs the Block Development Officer, Maitali Block, (respondent no.3) to decide the representation of the petitioner dated 26.12.2023 and pass a speaking order within a period of six weeks from the date of communication of this order after affording an opportunity of personal hearing to the petitioner.

7. With the aforesaid directions, the present writ petition is disposed of.

8. Since no affidavits have been filed by the respondents, the allegations made in the writ petition shall not be deemed to have been admitted.

9. Let urgent Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties on usual undertaking.

(Gaurang Kanth, J.)