

ML 52
06.05.2026
sayandeep
Ct.3.

WPA 1494 of 2025

Sri Ramkrishna Ghosh
Versus
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Chittapriya Ghosh
Mr. Kuntal Roy
Mr. Sandipan Pal
Ms. Ranjana Chowdhury
.... for the petitioner

Mr. Syamal Kr. Das
Ms. Krishna Yadav
Ms. Saheli Biswas
..... for the municipality

1. Today, the municipality pursuant to the order dated 13th January, 2026 has filed a report. The report would reveal that an inspection has been carried out by the municipality and the municipality has been able to ascertain that a room which was previously shown in the building plan as store room has been constructed as a residential unit, upon an application of a developer which has been sanctioned by the municipality vide sanctioned order dated 28th October, 2024. The revised sanctioned order has also been placed before this Court. The report further reveals that the common garage/parking space is available in the building in accordance with the sanctioned plan. Independent of the above, the petitioner has already taken steps before the District Consumer Disputes Redressal

Commission, North 24 parganas and a complaint case is pending against the developer.

2. Having heard the learned advocates appearing for the respective parties and noting from the petitioner that a matter is pending before the District Consumer Redressal Commission and also noting from the report that the conversion of the storage room is with the sanction of the municipal authorities, ordinarily, no interference is called for. The apart, the report further reveals that the garage/ parking space is available in the building in question and a complaint in this regard is pending consideration before the District Consumer Ridressal Commission. From the report, it does not transpire that there has been any deviation from the sanctioned building plan insofar as the common garage/parking space is concerned. Insofar as the conversion of the store room, though, the same is a subsequent development, however, I grant liberty to the petitioner to take recourse to the same in accordance with law.
3. The petitioner shall be at liberty to take the copy of the plan which has been placed by the municipality and has been taken on record. Accordingly, office is directed to make over a copy of the plan so submitted by the municipality to

the learned advocate-on-record of the petitioner against a receipt.

4. With the above observations and directions, the writ petition is disposed of.

(Raja Basu Chowdhury, J.)