

Ct.No.1 D/L 27.03.2026
09

Saikat
Mukherjee

WPA(P)/72/2026

**SK. ABDUL RASID AND ORS.
VS.
STATE OF WEST BENGAL AND ORS.**

Mr. Laskhminath Bhattacharya, Adv.
Mr. Subhankkar Bose, Adv.
Mr. Arpan Kr. Bairagi, Adv.

...For the Petitioners

Mr. Amal Kr. Sen, A.A.G.
Mr. Sabyasachi Mondal, Adv.

...For the State

Dictated By Partha Sarathi Sen, J.

- 1.** Affidavit-of-service, as filed on behalf of the writ petitioners, is taken on record.
- 2.** The petitioners and the Respondent-State are represented by their respective learned advocates.
- 3.** At the time of hearing learned counsel appearing on behalf of the writ petitioners at the very outset draws attention to the prayer made in the instant writ petition. It is submitted that the present writ petitioners in this Public Interest Litigation are aggrieved on account of non-completion of the construction of the village road from Ramkrishna Road from the house of Sk. Arshed Ali, Village-Paikhanlakshmi to the house of Mohan Sasmal, Village-Ramchandrapur under the jurisdiction of

Nandanpur-I Gram Panchayat, Police Station-Daspur, District-Paschim Medinipur.

4. It is submitted that from annexures to the instant writ petition it would reveal that due representations were given to the jurisdictional District Magistrate as well as to the jurisdictional BDO but such efforts went into vain.
5. Mr. Sen, learned Additional Advocate General, appearing on behalf of the Respondent-State in his usual fairness submits before us that Respondent No.3 may be directed to consider the representation of the petitioners in accordance with law.
6. We have meticulously gone through the entire materials as placed before us. We have also given due consideration over the submissions made by the learned advocates appearing on behalf of the contending parties.
7. Admittedly, the grievance of the writ petitioners in this Public Interest Litigation is non-completion of the road, particulars of which have been mentioned in the prayer of the instant writ petition as well as in the representation as submitted by the writ petitioners.
8. It appears to us that *prima facie* materials have been placed to substantiate that the aforesaid

road has not been completed to its fullest extent causing much prejudice and inconvenience to the inhabitants of the aforementioned village as well as the village situated in and around the said village.

9. In view of such, we while disposing the instant writ petition directs the Respondent No.3 authority to consider the representation dated 20th December, 2024 (Annexure-‘P3’ of the instant writ petition) in accordance with law after giving due opportunity of hearing to the authorised representative of the writ petitioners and/or any other stakeholders, if there be any and shall pass a reasoned order and shall communicate the same to the said authorised representative of the writ petitioners and any other stakeholders soon thereafter.

10. The entire exercise, as indicated in the foregoing paragraphs, is to be completed by the Respondent No.3 within 90 working days from the date of communication of the server copy of this order.

11. Time limit, as fixed by this court, is peremptory and mandatory.

12. It is further directed that in the event, while disposing the representation of the writ petitioners the Respondent No.3 authority finds

sufficient merit in such representation, he is directed to take all consequential steps soon thereafter.

13.With the aforementioned observations and directions, WPA (P) No.72 of 2026 is **disposed of**.

14.Before parting with, we, however, made clear that while disposing the instant writ petition we have not gone into the merit of the representation dated 20th December, 2024 and thus, all points are kept open for adjudication by the Respondent No.3 authority.

15.Urgent Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties, on priority basis, upon compliance of all necessary formalities.

(SUJOY PAUL, CJ.)

(PARTHA SARATHI SEN, J.)