

26th May, 2026
(Vacation Bench)
Item no.D/L 29
Court No. 02

Pradip, A.R.(Ct.)

In the High Court at Calcutta
Civil Revisional Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

Case No. **CO 1779 of 2026**

In the matter of :
Inland World Logistics Private Limited
.... Petitioner
VS.
Board of Trustees of Syama Prasad Mookherjee Port,
Kolkata & Anr.
....Opposite Parties

For the Petitioner:
Mr. Debjit Mukherjee
Mr. Rakesh Jain
Mr. Sourav Thakur
....Advocates

For the KOPT:
Mr. Santosh Kumar Ray
Ms. Shirijita Ray
....Advocates

1. The revisionist and the opposite party are represented by their respective counsel.
2. On behalf of the opposite party an accommodation has been prayed for.
3. The prayer for accommodation is considered and allowed.
4. In this revisional application the order dated 13th May, 2026 as passed by the Estate Officer is impugned.
5. Mr. Mukherjee learned advocate appearing on behalf of the petitioner/opposite party no. 2 before the Estate Officer at the very outset draws attention of this Court to Page Nos. 16 & 17 of the instant revisional application being a notice dated 16th January, 2026 as issued by the Estate Officer against the opposite parties therein.

6. Drawing attention to Page no. 22 of the instant revisional application, it is submitted by Mr. Mukherjee that from the said document being a copy of the letter dated 14th August, 1990 it would reveal that respondent no. 2/company was granted license by the Port Trust authority which initiated a proceeding against the present revisionist claiming huge amount from the present revisionist.
7. At the time of hearing, Mr. Mukherjee, however, could not show any such document of claim as allegedly made by the Port Trust authority or by the Estate Officer.
8. On the contrary, on perusal of the order impugned it reveals that before the Estate Officer, the present revisionist being the opposite party no. 2 therein has prayed for a joint inspection of the schedule premises by way of filing a petition which has been turned down by the Estate Officer.
9. It is submitted by Mr. Mukherjee that the said order is an unreasoned order.
10. This Court after careful perusal of the entire materials as placed before this Court and after considering the submission made by Mr. Mukherjee finds that it is the specific case of the present revisionist that the present revisionist is no way connected with the property in question.
11. No materials could be placed before this Court that any demand has been made by the Port Trust authority from the present revisionist or to that effect a favourable finding has been made by the Estate Officer whereby the Port authority can recover damages from the present

revisionist, that is, opposite party no. 2. before the Estate Officer.

12. Since it is the case of the present revisionist/opposite party no. 2 before the Estate Officer that he was no way connected with the property in question; the question of any suffering on account of rejection of the prayer for joint inspection appears to be illogical.

13. With the aforementioned observations, the instant revisional application being **CO 1779 of 2026** is dismissed.

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

(Partha Sarathi Sen, J.)