

Form No.J(2)

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

Present : The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya
&
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Supratim Bhattacharya

WPLRT No. 6 of 2026

Smt. Tulsi Rani Samanta and another
-vs-
The State of West Bengal and others

For the petitioners : Syed Shamsul Arefin.

For the respondent : Mr. Jaharlal De, AGP
Mr. Sudipto Panda

Heard on : February 11, 2026.

Judgment on : February 11, 2026.

Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.:

1. On the prayer of learned counsel for the petitioners, we mould the relief erroneously sought in the writ petition and deem the writ petition to be a challenge to the order dated August 26, 2025 passed by the West Bengal Land Reforms and Tenancy Tribunal.

2. The affidavit-of-service filed in Court today be kept on record.
3. In view of both sides being represented before us, we take up the writ petition for hearing.
4. By the impugned order, the Tribunal recorded that a contempt application has been filed in the year 2023 in respect of alleged violation of an order dated November 29, 2011 passed in OA No. 1682 of 2010 and an order dated April 7, 2022 passed in OA No. 1107 of 2020, both passed by the Tribunal.
5. The brief backdrop of the case is that vide order dated November 29, 2011 in OA No. 1682 of 2010, the alleged contemnor had been directed to dispose of a representation of the writ petitioners within a particular period of time.
6. However, no contempt application was filed by the writ petitioners within the limitation period, despite such direction being not been complied with by disposing of such representation.
7. Instead thereof, the writ petitioners preferred a fresh application, bearing OA No. 1107 of 2020, ten years later, which was ultimately withdrawn by the writ petitioners with liberty to file a fresh representation before the concerned authority.

8. Thus, insofar as the order dated November 29, 2011 passed in OA No. 1682 of 2010 is concerned, the contempt application is hopelessly time-barred. Moreover, in view of the subsequent original application, where the writ petitioners obtained leave to file a fresh representation, the order dated November 29, 2011 passed in the earlier original application was deemed to be given a go-by.
9. In the order dated April 7, 2022 passed in OA No. 1107 of 2020, no direction was passed at all on the respondent authority; rather, the said OA was permitted to be withdrawn with liberty to the writ petitioners to take out a fresh representation. Hence, there does not arise any question of violation of the said order by the respondent-authorities.
10. Thus, we completely agree with the observation of the learned Tribunal that there was no contempt committed by the respondent-authorities in respect of either of the orders passed by the Tribunal. In any event, the contempt application was hopelessly time-barred insofar as the order dated November 29, 2011 is concerned.
11. Accordingly, the contempt application was rightly disposed of without taking any penal measure.

12. We do not find any scope of interference with the impugned order.
13. Hence, WPLRT No. 6 of 2026 is dismissed on contest, thereby affirming the impugned order dated August 26, 2025 passed in MA 430 of 2023, arising out of OA No. 1107 of 2020 (LRTT).
14. There will be no order as to costs.
15. Urgent photostat certified copies of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties at an early date.

I agree.

(Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.)

(Supratim Bhattacharya, J.)