

M/L 130  
07.05.2026  
Court No.18  
SD

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA  
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION

WPA 7312 of 2026

Anup Kumar Sarkar

Vs.

The Union of India & Ors.

*Md. Sarwar Jahan*

*Mr. Ashraful Huq*

*Ms. Sahina Parvin*

*... for the Petitioner.*

*Mr. Baidurya Ghosal*

*Mr. Saikat Mukherjee*

*... for the Respondent Nos.2-6.*

1. The petitioner was serving on casual basis in the Bangiya Gramin Vikash Bank.
2. By a communication dated August 2, 2011, the petitioner was intimated to communicate the bank as to whether he was willing to be regularized in any Branch/Office of the bank within the service jurisdiction of the bank. The petitioner did reply to the said communication.
3. Allegation is that the bank did not intimate the petitioner any further. According to the petitioner, he is still willing to be regularized in any branch/office of the bank.
4. Prayer has been made to direct the bank to take a decision in response to the petitioner's representation received by the bank in August 2011.
5. Learned advocate representing the West Bengal Gramin Bank submits that the bank where the petitioner was serving, i.e. Bangiya Gramin Vikash Bank does not exist at present. The said bank stood

amalgamated with the West Bengal Gramin Bank and the Bangiya Gramin Vikash Bank does not have any independent existence at present.

6. It has been submitted that the advice which was sought for from the petitioner in the year 2011 cannot be revived in the year 2026.

7. Upon hearing the submission made on behalf of both the parties and upon perusal of the materials on record and upon noticing that the petitioner is currently aged 57 years, the Court is not inclined to exercise jurisdiction in the matter.

8. Had the petitioner any intention to remain engaged with the bank in accordance with his consent given in August 2011, he ought to have pursued his prayer diligently. After his intimation in August 2011, the petitioner approached this Court for the first time in March 2026.

9. The Court cannot come to the aid of an indolent litigant. The writ petition appears to be hopelessly time barred. The same stands dismissed.

10. Parties to act on the basis of the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official *website* of this Court.

**(Amrita Sinha, J.)**