

24.03.2026
36
as

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Circuit Bench at Jalpaiguri**

WPA 429 of 2026

**Sreebas Chandra Roy
@ Shribasa Chandra Roy
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Bibek Tarafder.
...for the Petitioner.

Mr. Sumit Kumar.
...for the State.

1. Affidavit of service filed in Court today is taken on record.
2. The petitioner has preferred the present writ petition seeking rectification of the LR Record of Rights (LRROR) in respect of the landed property measuring 0.73 Acre recorded in LR Khatian No.207, corresponding to RS Khatian No.32/1, in LR Plot No.1753, corresponding to RS Plot No.1267, JL No.86, in Mouza- Uttar Khalpara, P.S. Malbazar, District- Jalpaiguri.
3. Learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the land in question was earlier belonged to the petitioner's late mother Smt. Purna Bala Roy by way of inheritance. Upon her demise, the property devolved upon

the petitioner and other legal heirs. It is further submitted that the petitioner came to know through Misc. Case No.MN/2023/0705/3749 dated 09.11.2023 that the said property has been recorded in the name of respondent No.5 and the LRROR has been recorded in favour of the respondent No.5 on the basis of a purported fraudulent sale deed dated 06.11.1985. Learned Counsel submits that the petitioner's mother had never transferred the said property in favour of the respondent No.5 and the alleged recording has been effected without affording an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner or the other legal heirs. It is further submitted that despite filing written complaints, the competent authority has taken no action.

4. Learned Counsel for the respondent states that an order has already been passed by the Block Land and Land Reforms Officer dated 23.11.2023 in respect of the said plot of land. It is contended that the said order is an appealable order and the petitioner, if aggrieved ought to avail the statutory remedy of appeal.

5. Having heard the learned Counsel for the parties and perused the materials on record, considering the nature of the grievance of the

petitioner, this Court is of the view that the issues involve disputed question of facts including title and validity of the alleged transfer which cannot be adjudicated in exercise of writ jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. The petitioner has an efficacious alternative remedy available before the competent authority under the relevant provision of the Land Laws for correction/rectification of the record of rights as well as before the competent Civil Court for adjudication of title, if so advised.

6. In such circumstances, this Court is not inclined to entertain the present writ petition.

7. Accordingly, the present writ petition stands disposed of by granting liberty to the petitioner to approach before the appropriate forum in accordance with law.

8. Since no affidavits have been called for, all allegations made in the writ petition shall be deemed to have been denied.

(Gaurang Kanth, J.)