

22.01.2026
rc/ct.no.05
Item No.15+16

WPA No. 380 of 2026
Smt. Sarbani Dutta @ Srabani Datta & Ors.
Versus
The State of West Bengal & Ors.
And
WPA No. 29267 of 2025
Anirban Basu & Ors.
Versus
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Ramashis Mukherjee
Mr. Rameshwar Sinha ..for the Petitioners

Mrs. Sucharita Roy Bhattacharjee
Mr. Debasish Karfor the State
(WPA No. 380 of 2026)

Mr. Jayanta Samanta
Mrs. Paromita Malakar (Dutta)for the
State
(WPA No. 29267 of 2025)

Mr. Karan Dudhewala
Mr. Arjun Bhajan
Mr. Shivam Pathak
Mr. Kamran Hussain
....for the private respondents

Since the prayers in both the writ petitions are identical, the writ petitions are taken up together for consideration.

Affidavits of service filed by the petitioner and reports submitted by the State are taken on record.

The petitioners claim to be local devotees who have been performing worship in the temple popularly known as “Hudco Kali Mandir”. The petitioners allege that the private respondents who are local shop owners are trying to encroach upon the temple, create nuisance

therein and restrain the locals from offering puja. The petitioners lodged complaint before the police authority in this regard which was not acted upon. During the Christmas vacation of the Court, the private respondents broke open the padlock of the temple and took possession of the same.

Denying and disputing the allegations made by the petitioners, learned counsel for the private respondents submits that the petitioners are in fact rank outsiders and are trying to disturb the regular worship of the temple. The private respondents are members of the Executive Committee of the temple which stands on the land of the Asansol-Durgapur Development Authority.

It appears from the report submitted by the State that enquiry has been held pursuant to the complaint lodged by the petitioners. It is found that the petitioners themselves attempted to assert excessive control over the temple premises by putting a padlock therein to prevent devotees and members of the public at large from entering the temple and offering worship. The said padlock has been removed and a common lock arrangement made so that the temple premises is accessible to all devotees without any discrimination. No cognizable offence was found to have been committed by the private respondents. The private

respondents have also lodged a complaint against the petitioners on December 30, 2025.

Though the petitioners have claimed that the temple was locked by the private respondents during the winter vacation of the Court, it is found that Ratanti Kali Puja was held in the temple on January 18, 2026, meaning thereby, that the temple was opened for the worshippers even after the winter vacation.

Upon consideration of the submission made on behalf of the parties, this Court is of the view that the petitioners have failed to substantiate their contention made out in the writ petition. The complaint lodged by them has been taken care of. A common lock arrangement has been made in the temple which provides access to the public at large. The writ petitions are devoid of any merit and are liable to be dismissed.

Accordingly both the writ petitions are dismissed.

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

Since no affidavits are invited, the allegations contained in the writ petitions 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)