

WPA 5394 of 2026

**M/s Rameswara Leasing Pvt. Ltd.
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Arindam Banerjee
Mr. Amarta Ghose
Mr. Souryadeep Ghosh
...for the petitioner

Mr. Jayanta Samanta
Mr. Supriya Mazumdar
...for the State

Mr. Kushal Chatterjee
Md. Ammar Zaki
Mr. Souvik Das
Mr. Mr. Rudranil Das
...for the respondent nos. 9 to 13

Mr. Kalyan Kumar Chakraborty
Mr. G. Singh
...for the respondent nos. 15 to 17

1. Affidavit of service filed on behalf of the petitioner is taken on record.
2. Matter is heard in presence of the learned advocates representing the petitioner, State respondents and private respondents.
3. It is submitted by Mr. Arindam Banerjee, learned senior advocate representing the petitioner that during pendency of title suit being T.S. No. 692 of 2025 pending before Civil Judge, (Jr. Division) 4th Court, Howrah, part of the land in question is unauthorisedly used by some of the private respondents as burial

ground. It is submitted that an *ad interim* order of injunction was obtained by the petitioner on 14th May, 2025 in connection with the pending suit being T.S. 692 of 2025, but at present, situation is altered since other persons who are not parties to the suit are creating disturbances and using the part of land in question as burial ground.

4. Learned advocate representing the private respondents has opposed this writ petition in view of pendency of suit and it is submitted that *inter se* rights of the parties in connection with the land in question needs to be decided in the said suit. It is also submitted that alleging violation of *ad interim* order of injunction dated 14th May, 2025 an application is filed before the Civil Court and same is still pending.
5. In view of aforesaid scenario Court is not inclined to interfere with the matter keeping view of the fact that suit as well as application alleging violation of *ad interim* order dated 14th May, 2025 is pending.
6. If at this stage Court directs the police authorities to take steps in order to protect the right of the petitioner in that event nothing remains to be decided in the pending suit.

7. Hence, writ petition is dismissed.
8. However this order shall not preclude the petitioner to take steps in pursuit of remedy by approaching the appropriate forum.
9. Urgent photostat certified copy of the order, if applied for, be given to the parties, upon usual undertakings.

(Saugata Bhattacharyya, J.)