

36      **30.03.2026**  
(DL)      Court No. 05  
             (Suvendu Mukherjee)

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA**  
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION  
(APPELLATE SIDE)

**WPA 6809 of 2026**

**M/s. Chowdhury Enterprises Private Limited**  
**-Versus -**

**The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Sushanta Dutta  
Mr. R.K. Basu  
Ms. Juin Dutta Chakraborty  
Mr. Bidan Modak

...for the petitioner

Mr. Jaydip Kar  
Mr. Soumya Majumder  
Mr. Sayak Ranjan Ganguly  
Mr. Srijan Ghosh  
Ms. Kripa Kanu

.....for the private respondent nos. 5-36

Mr. Suman Dey

....for the private respondent nos. 37-43

Mr. Rabindra Nath Pal  
Mr. Partha Sarathi Sengupta

...for the State respondents

- 1) Affidavit of service filed on behalf of the petitioner is taken on record.
- 2) Matter is heard in presence of learned advocates representing the parties.
- 3) It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that though land in question belongs to the petitioner but

illegally by executing a conveyance deed same was transferred to the private respondents. Petitioner apprehends soon construction will commence at the instance of the private respondents over the land in question requiring direction upon the concerned police authorities to restrain private respondents.

4) Mr. Kar, learned Senior Advocate representing private respondent nos. 5 to 36 has disputed the submission made on behalf of the petitioner and *locus standi* of the petitioner is also questioned on behalf of the private respondents.

5) A communication dated 27<sup>th</sup> March, 2026 of Officer-in-Charge of Purba Jadavpur Police Station, Kolkata is filed by the learned advocate representing the State respondents and same is taken on record.

6) Learned advocate representing the State respondents has submitted that no cognizable offence is alleged to have been committed. Therefore, till date FIR has not been registered.

7) Having considered the respective submissions made on behalf of the parties and taking note of the materials available on record, it appears that petitioner is trying to assert his right over the land in question being the owner of said land. It is submitted that rights of the petitioner to possess the land in question and execute the conveyance deed in connection with

said land are being infringed at the instance of the private respondents. If petitioner is aggrieved due to execution of conveyance deed ignoring his right over the land in question, petitioner shall be at liberty to approach the civil court in pursuit of his remedy. Police authorities are not authorized to decide *inter se* right of the parties over the land in question. Hence, this Court is not inclined to interfere with the writ petition.

8) Writ petition stands dismissed.

9) However, this order shall not preclude the petitioner to take steps in accordance with law.

10) There shall be no order as to costs.

11) Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties on usual undertaking.

**(Saugata Bhattacharyya, J.)**