

Form No.J(2)

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

Present : The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya
&
The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Supratim Bhattacharya

WPLRT No. 199 of 2025

Sanjay Kunmar Paria and others
-vs-
The State of West Bengal and others

For the petitioners : Mr. Supriyo Chattopadhyay,
Mr. Sudip Kumar Maiti,
Ms. Debosri Chatterjee.

For the State : Mr. Lalit Mohan Mahata, AGP.,
Mr. Himadri Kumar Mahata

Heard on : February 10, 2026.

Judgment on : February 10, 2026.

Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.:

1. The affidavit-of-service filed in Court today be kept on record.
2. Despite service, none appears for the private respondents, although the writ petitioners and the State are represented through counsel.

3. The present challenge is on a very limited compass.
4. The writ petitioners, complaining that the records of rights ought to be corrected, having erroneously depicted the name of the private respondents as the recorded owners, made an application to that effect, which was rejected by the Revenue Officer, being aggrieved by which an appeal was preferred under Section 54 of the West Bengal Land Reforms Act, 1955.
5. The appellate authority affirmed the finding of the first forum, against which an original application was preferred by the petitioners before the West Bengal Land Reforms and Tenancy Tribunal (hereinafter referred to "the Tribunal"), giving rise to OA No. 1446 of 2022 (LRTT).
6. The present writ petition has been filed against certain findings rendered by the learned Tribunal while disposing of the said OA.
7. Learned counsel for the writ petitioners submits that although the writ petitioners are otherwise not aggrieved by the conclusion of the Tribunal in the judgment passed in OA No. 1446 of 2022 (LRTT), to the effect that the matter was remanded to the appellate authority for a fresh adjudication on

merits on the grounds as mentioned in the said judgment, some of the observations made in the impugned judgment may adversely affect the interest of the writ petitioners.

8. Learned counsel for the writ petitioners takes us through certain observations made at internal page 10 of the impugned judgment, to the effect that the original application of the writ petitioners before the Tribunal was made with confusing averments and prayers and the same was devoid of any merit.
9. It was further recorded that the averments incorporated in the original application were full of confusion because of perfunctory drafting.
10. However, we are unable to agree with the contention of learned counsel for the writ petitioners that such observations affect the merits of the contentions of the parties and/or the interests of the writ petitioners in any substantial manner.
11. Comments of the Tribunal on the unhappy drafting of the original application and that the same was “devoid of merit” did not have any effect on the outcome of the original application, since the Tribunal, in any event, jotted down categorically the specific points where the appellate authority went wrong and,

on such premise, remanded the matter to the appellate authority for disposal afresh by a reasoned order by considering the relevant factual aspects and documents brought on record by the parties.

12. Thus, there was no error on the part of the Tribunal.
13. Moreover, no legal rights and/or interest of the writ petitioners have been infringed merely by recording the observations by which the writ petitioners are aggrieved. In any event, it is well-settled that no challenge lies merely against findings in the impugned order if the conclusion is in favour of the challenger.
14. Hence, there is no scope of interference with the impugned judgment.
15. Accordingly, WPLRT No. 199 of 2025 is disposed of, without interfering with the impugned judgment dated August 14, 2025 passed by the Fourth Bench, West Bengal Land Reforms and Tenancy Tribunal in OA No. 1446 of 2022 (LRTT), in the light of the above observations.
16. There will be no order as to costs.

17. Urgent photostat certified copies of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties at an early date.

I agree.

(Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.)

(Supratim Bhattacharya, J.)