

8
25.06.2026
sb
Ct.3.

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE

WPA 11325 of 2026

S. M. Riaz Bhati
Versus
The Kolkata Municipal Corporation & Ors.

Mr. Raghunath Chakraborty
Mr. Subharangsu Panda
Ms. Haritri Roy
Mr. Ratul Ghosal
Mr. Anupam Singha
... For the petitioner.

Mr. Biswajit Mukherjee
Mrs. Sima Chakraborty
... For the Kolkata Municipal Corporation.

1. Affidavit of service filed in Court is taken on record.
2. The petitioner seeks to challenge the order dated 26th July, 2025, issued by the Chief Manager, (Revenue North), Kolkata Municipal Corporation, whereby it was observed that there was no irregularity on the part of the department in not giving effect to the application in Form A75-1 submitted by the petitioner as such application was for revision of assessment when the tenant moves out.
3. The matter has a previous history. The petitioner who is a tenant/occupier of premises no. 10/2/1 Kashi Nath Mullick Lane, Kolkata had filed an application in Form A75-1, before the Kolkata Municipal Corporation seeking revision of valuation. Since, such application was

kept pending, the petitioner has approached this Court in WPA 25682 of 2024. By an order dated 13th June, 2025, the same was disposed of by directing the Chief Manager (Revenue) (North), Kolkata Municipal Corporation to consider the petitioner's representation dated 22nd July, 2024 in accordance with law, after affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. In furtherance thereto, the Chief Manager (Revenue North) has decided the cause. He had by his order dated 26th July, 2025 observed that application in Form A75-1 can be filed for revision of assessment when tenant moves out. However, the application in Form A75-2 can be filed in case when a fresh tenancy is created. Since, in the instant case, according to him the petitioner had notified the municipality for creation of a fresh tenancy, the petitioner ought to have filed an application in Form A75-2.

4. Mr. Chakraborty, learned advocate representing the petitioner would, however, submit that the petitioner has already complied with the above direction and has filed an application in Form A75-2, he insists for disposal of such application pending before the respondent authorities.

5. Having heard the learned advocates appearing for the respective parties and having considered the materials on record I find that the petitioner himself claims to an occupier and is aggrieved by the determination/revision of annual valuation and is interested to seek reconsideration thereof. Previously on the petitioner having approached

this Court, by an order dated 13th June, 2025, the coordinate Bench had directed the Chief Manager Revenue (North) to consider the petitioner's representation. The order impugned does not appear to be strictly in accordance with such direction. In view thereof I direct the Chief Manager Revenue (North), Kolkata Municipal Corporation to decide on the petitioner's application dated 22nd September, 2025 appearing at page 77, being Annexure-P-4 of the writ petition in accordance with law, after giving an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner on an expeditious basis preferably within a period of six weeks from the date of communication of this order.

6. With the above observations and directions, the writ petition is disposed of.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for be given to the parties upon compliance with the requisite formalities.

(Raja Basu Chowdhury, J.)