23.11.2026
Ct. No. 444
Sl. No. 27
RANJAN

WPA 11443 of 2026

MR. SNIGDHENDU KUMAR SHOW
VS.
THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL & ORS.

Mr. Sambuddha Dutta
Mr. Puranjan Pal
.....for the petitioner
Mrs. Indrani Chakraborty
Mr. Jyotiska Panja
Mrs. Sarda Sha
.....for the State
Mr. Subhasis Bandopadhyay
.....for the Municipality

Affidavit of Service, as filed, be kept with the record.

Briefly, the writ petitioner filed this writ petition due to non-consideration of the representation dated 06.04.2026 at the behest of the private respondent no. 8, and for illegal construction, obstruction, and disruption being carried out.

Learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the writ petitioner, in his usual fairness, submits that there is no dispute over ownership of the plot where the petitioner is residing. However, the adjacent plot holder, being the private respondent no. 8, is carrying out certain illegal and unauthorised construction, for which he has been compelled to submit a representation on

06.04.2026, and the same is still unattended. For this reason, the instant writ petition has been filed, praying for a direction upon respondent no. 4 to consider the representation.

Learned Advocate appearing on behalf of the Burdwan Municipality denies and disputes each and every allegation in the writ petition, and further submits that the Authority is to make an endeavor to dispose of the representation within a reasonable period.

The State is represented.

After considering the submissions of the respective parties and the facts in issue as pleaded in the writ petition, this Court is of the opinion that the instant writ petition may be disposed of by directing respondent no. 4 to consider the representation dated 06.04.2026 within 12 weeks from the date of communication of this order, after affording an opportunity of hearing to all necessary and interested parties, and shall pass a reasoned order.

The reasoned order so passed by him be communicated within a period of two weeks thereafter to all interested parties.

However, it is clear that this Court has not gone into the merits of the case, and that respondent no. 4 has been given liberty to consider the representation strictly in accordance

with law. As the Affidavit has not been called for, the allegations levelled against the Municipality in the writ petition are deemed denied by all the parties.

Thus, the writ petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

Parties to act on the basis of server copy.

An urgent photostat-certified copy of this order, if applied for, be made available to the parties upon compliance with the necessary formalities.

[ATARUP BANERJEE, J.]