

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE

WPA 3737 of 2026

Gouranga Sikder
Versus
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Debabrata Roy
Ms. Sarbani Mukhopadhyay
... For the petitioner.

Mr. Soumya Mukherjee
For the municipality.

Ms. Tanusri Chandra
.... For the State.

Mr. Dyutimoy Paul
.... For the respondent no.8.

1. The writ petition has been filed complaining illegal construction at the behest of the respondent No. 8. On 25th March, 2026, since the respondent No. 8 had disclosed a revised sanctioned plan, the municipality was directed to take instructions as regards the same. Subsequently, on 6th May, 2026, though, Mr. Bihani, learned sr. advocate representing the municipality had submitted that revised sanctioned plan had been issued, since no report to substantiate the same had been filed, this Court had directed the municipality to file a report in the form of an affidavit when the matter is taken up next. Today, it is submitted on behalf of the municipality that the report is yet to be

prepared. Mr. Mukherjee, learned advocate representing the municipality would submit that the concerned Executive Engineer was on leave and as such the report could not be prepared.

2. Having regard to the aforesaid and since the municipality is somehow avoiding to take a stand by filing a report before this Court as directed by order dated 6th May, 2026, in my view, at this stage, it shall be appropriate for this Court to direct the private respondent to stay its hands till the matter is taken up next.
3. At this stage, the learned advocate for the private respondent would submit that after the writ petition was filed, no further construction has taken place.
4. Accordingly, list this matter under the heading "To Be Mentioned" on 10th June, 2026.

(Raja Basu Chowdhury, J.)