

05.06.2026

Item no.D/L 07
Court No. 08

Pradip, A.R.(Ct.)
Sudipta, A. R. (Ct.)

In the High Court at Calcutta
Civil Appellate Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

Case No.

MAT 940 of 2026
With
CAN 1 of 2026

In the matter of :

Shahnaj Akhtari & Anr.

.... Appellants

VS.

Indradevi Sonkar & Ors.

....Respondents

For the Appellants:

Mr. Avirup Chatterjee
Mr. Rishov Das

....Advocates

For the Respondent no. 1 :

Mr. Sumitava Chakraborty
Ms. Bratati Pramanick

....Advocates

For the HMC :

Mr. Sandipan Banerjee
Mr. Ankit Surekha

....Advocates

1. Affidavit of service filed in Court today is taken on record.
2. None appears on behalf of the State, although the writ petitioner and the Municipality are represented.
3. Heard learned counsels for the parties.
4. It appears from the order of the learned Single Bench dated 22.05.2026 that as the respondent nos. 7 & 8 failed to cause appearance, the Officer-in-Charge of the concerned Police Station being the respondent no. 6 was directed to ensure the presence of the aforesaid respondents before the Court when the matter was to

be taken up next. Although in the preceding paragraph, there is a recording made by the learned Single Bench that it was found to be a fit case where the respondent nos. 7 & 8 should be directed at the first instance to relocate the petitioner to a separate residence commensurate to the present occupancy of the petitioner, however, the matter was kept pending so that the respondent nos. 7 & 8 could be heard.

5. As an interim measure the Municipality was directed not to take any action in so far as the petitioner's portion was concerned. The matter was directed to appear before the Single Bench on 17th June, 2026 at 2.00 P.M.
6. Therefore, it does not appear that any positive direction was given by the learned Single Bench upon the respondent nos. 7 & 8 to actually relocate the writ petitioner to another accommodation. Although the issue was deliberated upon, a date was fixed for appearance of the respondent no. 7 and 8. The only interim order passed was a direction upon the Municipality was given not to take any action in so far as the petitioner's portion was concerned.
7. Thus, writ petition is yet to be decided finally by the learned Single Bench and a specific date and time has been fixed for hearing of the same.
8. Therefore, we do not find any worthwhile reason to interfere with the impugned order.
9. With the aforesaid observations, the appeal and the connected application are disposed of without any further order, even as to costs.

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

(Jay Sengupta, J.)

(Smita Das De J.)