

Sl.11
10.11.2025
Court No.19
BP

C.O. 24982 of 2025

Sri Aniruddha Hazra alias
Alok Kumar Hazra
-versus-
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Gopal Chandra Ghosh, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Rajkrishna Mondal
..for the petitioner

Mr. Joydip Banerjee
Ms. Priyanka Mukherjee
..for the State

Mr. Ghosh, learned senior advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that there is a typographical error in the cause title of the writ petition and the 6th respondent being the Block Land and Land Reforms Officer, Sutahata-I, Purba Medinipur was not impleaded as party respondent in the writ petition.

On the prayer made by Mr. Ghosh, leave is granted to the learned advocate on record of the petitioner to implead the Block Land and Land Reforms Officer, Sutahata-I, Purba Medinipur as the 6th respondent in the writ petition.

Let such amendment be carried out, here and now.

The petitioner alleges that L.R. Plot No. 531 measuring about 22 decimals was recorded in the name of the individual raiyats. However, from the record of rights which is appearing at page 40 of the writ petition it appears that the name of the "Development Roads" was

recorded as raiyat against Dag No. 531/823 under khatian No. 558 within mouza Nandarampur measuring about 6 decimals.

Mr. Ghosh, learned senior advocate appearing for the petitioner submits that without initiating any proceedings for acquisition or requisition the portion of plot no. 531 was shown to have been recorded in the name of the development roads under khatian no. 558.

On query of the Court as to how khatian no.558 was created thereby carving out a Bata Plot no. 823 from L.R. Plot No. 531, the learned advocate appearing for the State seeks time to take instructions in this regard.

Let a report in the form of an affidavit be filed by the respondent no.6 being the Block Land and Land Reforms Officer, Sutahata-I, Purba Medinipur on or before November 17, 2025.

List this matter on November 19, 2025 under the heading "For Orders".

After going through the materials on record it prima facie appears to this Court that the creation of Bata Dag from L.R. Plot No. 531 is without any basis.

The learned advocate for the State could not explain the basis of creation of Bata plot.

In view thereof, this Court is inclined to pass an interim order.

It appears from the impugned order dated 8th September, 2025 that the petitioner was directed to

remove the encroachment in the suit plot by November 8, 2025.

There shall be an interim order restraining the respondent authorities from taking any steps or further steps in terms of the order dated 8th September, 2025 passed by the Executive Magistrate, Haldia till the end of the month of November, 2025 or until further orders whichever is earlier.

(Hiranmay Bhattacharyya, J.)