

AD – 11
Ct No.2
26.05.2026
(SSS)

WPA 11930 of 2026

Li Tai Yu
Vs.
The State of West Bengal and Ors.

Mr. Debashis Banerjee,
Mr. Debamitra Bhardwaj,
Mr. Arijit Sardar, Advs.
.....For the petitioner.

Mr. Sananda Chatterjee, Advs.
....For the proforma respondent no. 7.

Mr. Dibyendu Narayan Ray, Ld. G.P & Snr. Adv.,
Mr. Madhu Jana, Ld. Jnr. Govt. Adv.,
Mr. Rhitam Chatterjee, Advs.
...For the State.

1. At the time of hearing, the learned advocate for the petitioner submits before this Court that he is not pressing the prayer made in prayer 'b' of the instant writ petition.
2. In view of such submission, the prayer for issuance of writ commanding the jurisdictional officer-in-charge to lodge FIR on the basis of the written complaint dated 14.05.2026 is considered and rejected.
3. In support of the prayer 'c' of the instant writ petition, learned advocate for the writ petitioner at the very outset draws the attention of this Court to page nos. 68 and 69 of the instant writ petition

being a copy of the written complaint dated 14.05.2026 as submitted with the officer-in-charge, Pragati Maidan Police Station. From the said written complaint, it would reveal that it is the grievance of the writ petitioner that the private respondents for no reason whatsoever and without having any lawful right put padlock on the door of temple in question and thus restrained the writ petitioner from entering into the temple.

4. In considered view of this Court, the remedy of the writ petitioner does not lie before the Writ Court. It appears to this Court that for ventilating his right, title and interest over the temple in question, the writ petitioner has adequate alternative and suitable remedy.

5. In view of such, this Court is constrained to hold that the instant writ petition is not maintainable and is thus hereby dismissed.

6. There will be no order as to costs.

7. Photostat certified copies of this order, if applied for, be furnished to the parties on compliance of due formalities.

(Partha Sarathi Sen, J.)