

03
rkd 06.04.2026
Ct.05

W.P.A. 5819 of 2026

Samiran Das

-vs-

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Amitava Chowdhury,
Mr. Debasis Sur

....for the petitioner.

Mr. Usof Ali Dewan,
Mr. Arup Sarkar,
Mr. Asif Dewan,
Mr. Mehedi Masud

....for the respondent nos.3 & 4.

Mr. Suman Ghosh,
Mr. Arka Mondal

....for the State.

1. Affidavit-of-service filed on behalf of the petitioner is taken on record.
2. Petitioner has approached this Court with the present writ petition, *inter alia*, praying for direction upon the concerned police authorities in order to resolve the dispute which is continuing between the petitioner and his son and daughter-in-law being respondent nos.3 & 4.
3. Learned advocate representing the State respondents has filed a communication dated 29th March, 2026 of Inspector-in-Charge Bamongola Police Station, Malda and same is taken on record. Copy of the said communication dated 29th March, 2026 is made over to the learned advocates representing the petitioner and respondent nos.3 & 4.
4. It is disclosed in the communication dated 29th

March, 2026 that petitioner purchased a shop for his son to run the business of flex printing, machine was procured by respondent no.4 by obtaining loan.

5. However, dispute cropped up between the petitioner and respondent no.4 as a result whereof petitioner along with his wife are staying separately from the month of April, 2025 with their daughter and son-in-law.
6. Concerned police authority has initiated a proceeding to maintain peace at the locale as it was found by the police authorities that both parties are desperate and aggressive in nature. A Non-FIR Prosecution no.339/2025 dated 2nd May, 2025 under Section 126 of BNSS was submitted.
7. Respondent nos.3 & 4 are represented by learned advocate who has opposed this writ petition and submits that dispute between the petitioner and the private respondents centers around running of business.
8. Taking note of the submissions made on behalf of the parties, it is found that petitioner along with his wife are staying separately from April, 2025 after the dispute cropped up relating to printing business with his son requiring the petitioner to approach the appropriate forum for remedy.
9. Police authority is not the appropriate authority to decide the dispute between the petitioner and son.

10. However, concerned police authorities are directed to maintain peace and tranquility at the locale and to see that petitioner may not be heckled by his son while running the business.
11. The writ petition stands disposed of.
12. Urgent photostat certified copy of the order, if applied for, be given to the parties, upon usual undertakings.

(Saugata Bhattacharyya, J.)