

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE**

Present:

**The Hon'ble Justice Debangsu Basak
And**

The Hon'ble Justice Md. Shabbar Rashidi

**RVW 276 of 2025
with
IA No.: CAN 1 of 2025
IA No.: CAN 2 of 2025**

**Prof. Anadi Kumar Kundu
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.
in
WPLRT 65 of 2025**

**Prof. Anadi Kumar Kundu
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

For the Review Applicant : Mr. Mrinal Kanti Ghosh, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Dibasish Basu, Ld. AGP
Ms. Sneha Dutta, Advocate
Mr. Purnendu Das, Advocate

Hearing & Judgment on : **June 29, 2026**

DEBANGSU BASAK, J.:-

1. Review applicant seeks review of the order dated May 13, 2025 passed in WPLRT/65/2025.

2. By the impugned order, we dismissed the writ petition of the review applicant being WPLRT/65/2025 directed against the order dated March 18, 2025 passed in MA 1292 of 2022 (OA No.2296 of 2022) (LRTT).
3. Learned Advocate appearing for the review applicant submits that, the review applicant could not make over all necessary documents relating to medical condition of the review applicant to the learned Advocate at the Tribunal as also before the High Court. He submits that, the review applicant was being treated by three doctors. He refers to the third medical certificate issued by the third doctor. He also refers to the prescription issued by those three doctors from time to time.
4. In response to a query of the Court, learned Advocate appearing for the review applicant submits that, the review applicant is entitled to medical reimbursement limited to Rs.500/-. He submits that, for the relevant period, the review applicant did not seek disbursement of medical expenses.
5. State is represented.
6. Review applicant approached the Land Reforms and Tenancy Tribunal by way of OA No.2296 of 2022. In such original application, the review applicant sought to challenge the order of vesting in respect of land claimed to be belonging to the review applicant.
7. In the original application, the review applicant filed an application for condonation of delay being MA 1292 of 2022.

8. By the order dated March 18, 2025, the learned Tribunal did not find any merit in the application for condonation of delay after taking into account the amnesty granted by the Hon'ble Supreme Court during the period of Covid on the ground that, no explanation was forthcoming as to the cause for the delay for the relevant period.
9. Review applicant assailed the order dated March 18, 2025 of the learned Tribunal by way of a writ petition being WPLRT/65/2025 which was disposed of by the order under review dated May 13, 2025. The review applicant seeks review of such order in the present proceedings.
10. In the order under review dated May 13, 2025, we noted that, on the basis of the averments made in the application for condonation of delay, the review applicant was aware of an order passed in Appeal Case No.133 of 2017 and that, the review applicant was participating in such appeal. We also noted that, the review applicant was aware that, the final order in such Appeal Case No.133 of 2017 was passed on November 20 of 2019.
11. In the order under review dated May 13, 2025, we also noted that, the contention of the review applicant that the review applicant became aware of the final order dated November 20, 2019 only on November 27, 2020 after the review applicant applied for certified copy of such order and received the certified copy of such order on January 28, 2020.
12. So far as limitation is concerned, we took note of the fact that, even if we allow the review applicant the liberty of condonation of delay till January 28, 2020 and after allowing the suspension of period of limitation between

March 15, 2020 till November 28, 2022 by reason of Covid, then also, there was no explanation by the review applicant for his conduct for the period from January 29, 2020 till March 14, 2020 as well as from March 1, 2022 till the date of filling of the original application.

13. In the present review application, the review applicant claims that, he was treated by three doctors during the year 2022. He claims those three doctors as Prof. (Dr.) K.K. De, Dr. Aditya Prasad Ray and Dr. Sumit Khotick.
14. Certificates issued by Prof. (Dr.) K.K. De and Dr. Aditya Prasad Ray were before the learned Tribunal and before us resulting in the order under review. Such certificates were found not to explain the delay caused for the periods we noted above.
15. Certificate of Dr. Sumit Khotick is for the period from March 1, 2022 till December 10, 2022. Certificate of Dr. K.K. De is for the period from February 4, 2020 till March 24, 2020. Certificate of Dr. Aditya Prasad Ray is for the period from March 1, 2022 till June 30, 2022. The review applicant filed the Original Application before the Tribunal on July 15, 2022 and the application for condonation of delay on December 13, 2022. If we accept the medical certificate of Dr. Sumit Khotick as true and correct then the review applicant was unwell for the period from March 1, 2022 till December 10, 2022. The review applicant was, however, able to file the Original Application on July 15, 2022 which belies his claim for

illness preventing him to approach the Tribunal. All these explanation for the delay caused during the period of time as noted above.

16. The certificate of Dr. Dr. Sumit Khotick is dated December 10, 2022. It speaks of review applicant being under treatment from March 1, 2022 till December 10, 2022. This version of the claim of treatment is not supported by the action of the review applicant contemporaneously.
17. As noted above, review applicant did not seek medical reimbursement of the expenses that the review applicant allegedly incurred for the medical treatments.
18. We do not find any ground to review our order dated May 13, 2025.
19. **RVW 276 of 2025** in **WPLRT 65 of 2025** is **dismissed** along with all connected applications.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

20. I agree.

(Md. Shabbar Rashidi, J.)