

8
31.3.2026
Court No. 10
AGM

**In The High Court At Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side**

W.P.A. 3417 of 2026

**Arun Kumar Maity
-versus
State of West Bengal & Ors.**

**Mr. N. I. Khan.
Mr. Amlan Kumar Mukherjee.
Mr. Dilip Kumar Mandal.
Mr. chiranjib Das.
...For the petitioner.**

**Mr. Pantu Deb Roy. Ld. A.G.P.
Mr. Subrata Guha Biswas.
... For the State.**

**Mr. Sakti Pada Jana.
Mrs. Sudipta Pramanik.
... For the private respondent.**

1. The petitioner in the instant case is an operator, and a stage carriage permit holder being P.St.P. No. 30/2003/IR in respect of a vehicle bearing registration no. WB-31A-7299 operating on the inter regional route Keyagaria to Barasat via Pichaboni, Contai, Henria, Mecheda, Howrah Rail Station, Kolkata CBS, VIP Road, Madhyamgram. The said permit, covering a length of 208 kms is valid till 4.3.2028.

2. Main grievance of the petitioner is that the private respondent is plying his vehicle according to a timetable, which is not in consonance with the route alignment mentioned in his permit.
3. The petitioner submits that the timetable should be granted in accordance with the route mentioned in the permit.
4. The private respondent submits that since 2001, he has been plying his vehicle on the route from Kayagaria via Digha, Ramnagar, Contai, Nandakumar, Mecheda via Howrah B.T. and Ghatakpur and back as an express service.
5. The private respondent produces the permit and the timetable to demonstrate that the private respondent has been plying the vehicle since 2001 in accordance with the timetable approved by the authority concerned, which has been kept on record.
6. It is further submitted that the timetable approved by the Department covers the route from Basanti to Ghatakpur via Jharkhali.
7. The petitioner raises an objection regarding the plying of the vehicle through Dharmatala, which is not a permissible route for the private respondent.

8. Learned counsel for the State respondent fairly submits that, since there is a dispute with regard to the timetable, the same may be resolved by a decision to be taken by respondent no. 4.
9. After careful consideration and upon perusal of the available records, I direct the respondent no. 4 to consider the objection raised by the petitioner by way of a representation dated 29.1.2026 within a period of 60 days. The authority shall pass a reasoned order in accordance with law, upon affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner, the private respondent and other stakeholders, if any, and communicate such decision within a week thereafter.
10. However, it is made clear that the respondent no. 2 shall consider the representation in the light of the notification dated 6.8.2004 and arrive at a reasoned conclusion regarding the permission for the vehicles to ply on the route in question.
11. The writ petition stands disposed of accordingly without taking any exception to the merits of the case.

12. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the learned counsel for the parties on usual undertakings.

(Smita Das De, J.)