

17.06.2026
Item No.15
Court No.37
CHC
(dismissed)

In The High Court at Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

RVW/205/2025
IA NO: CAN/1/2025
CAN/2/2025

Suraj Enterprise
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.
in
WPLRT/11/2024
Suraj Enterprise
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Abhratosh Mazumder, Senior Advocate
Mr. Arif Ali, Advocate
...for the review applicant

Mr. Dibasish Basu, Advocate
Ms. Sneha Dutta, Advocate
...for the State

Mr. Avishek Prasad, Advocate
...for the private respondents

1. Review applicant seeks review of the judgment and order dated April 30, 2025, passed in WPLRT 11 of 2024.
2. Learned Senior Advocate appearing for the review applicant draws the attention of the Court to the recording made in paragraph-7 of the judgment and order under review. He submits the recording in paragraph-7 that, the admitted position between the parties is a record of rights standing as on April 30, 2013 was in fact not an admitted position so far as

review applicant is concerned. In response to a query of the Court he submits that, the then learned advocates for the review applicant were not given such instructions to submit that, the record of rights as on April 30, 2013 was admitted between the parties.

3. State and the private respondents are represented.
4. We disposed of two writ petitions assailing orders dated October 5, 2023 passed by the West Bengal Land Reforms and Tenancy Tribunal in O.A. 2741 of 2018 (LRTT) and order dated October 5, 2023 passed in O.A. 2741 of 2018 (LRTT) by the judgment and order under review.
5. We are unable to agree with the contention of the review applicant that, the review applicant did not admit to the fact as recorded in paragraph-7 of the judgment and order under review. The judgment and order under review was dictated in presence of the learned advocates appearing for the review applicant.
6. The review applicant is now represented by a different set of advocates than the advocates who appeared in the judgment and order under review. There is no affidavit on the part of the learned advocates appearing for the review applicant at the time of passing of the judgment and order under review that, they were not given such requisite instructions or that they did not make the requisite submissions resulting in the recording as noted in paragraph-7 of the

judgment and order under review. There is no complaint by the review applicant to the appropriate authorities as against any such advocates alleging that, such advocates exceeded their instructions or allowed a recording to take place beyond their instructions.

7. The judgment and order under review was dictated in Court, in presence of the learned advocates appearing for the parties as noted in the judgment and order under review.
8. We find no grounds to exercise review jurisdiction in the facts and circumstances of the present case.
9. **RVW/205/2025** along with connected applications are **dismissed** without any order as to costs.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

(Md. Shabbar Rashidi, J.)