

20 - 22
12.12.2024
Ct No. 11
rrc

RVW 2408 of 2007
with
IA No.: CAN 1 of 2007(Old No.:CAN 9250 of 2007)

The State of West Bengal & Others
– Versus –
Sri Rajendra Agarwalla & Others
in
WPLRT 1115 of 2001

In

CPAN 659 of 2007

Sumitra Devi Agarwal
– Versus –
Sukumar Singha Ray & Others

In

CPAN 660 of 2007
Sri Rajendra Agarwalla & Others
– Versus –
Sukumar Singha Ray & Others

in

CPAN 661 of 2007
with
CAN 3 of 2017 (Old CAN 7954 of 2017)

Lakshmi Narayan Agarwal
– Versus –
Sukumar Singha Ray

AND

RVW 2407 of 2007
+
IA No.: CAN 1 of 2007 (Old No.: CAN 9254 of 2007)

The State of West Bengal & Ors.
- Versus
Lakshmi Narayan Agarwal

in

RVW 2409 of 2007
+

IA No.: CAN 1 of 2007 (Old No.: CAN 9255 of 2007)

The State of West Bengal & Others
– Versus –
Sumitra Devi Agarwal

Mr. Pradip Kumar Roy
Mr. Tirthajit Roy Chowdhury
... for the Writ Petitioners/
Opposite Parties
(in all matters)

Ms. Puja Banerjee
.... for the State/Respondents.

Record is placed in the list for the purpose of removal of certain irregularities as detected and reported.

Mr. Roy, learned advocate representing the applicants in CPAN 661 of 2007 submits that during pendency of this proceeding, one of the writ petitioners, namely, Lakshmi Narayan Agarwal passed away, leaving behind 9 legal heirs.

Accordingly, an application for substitution was filed, and in the cause title of the application, the names and particulars of the legal heirs were mentioned. However, inadvertently, the names and particulars of two legal heirs, namely, Ashok Kumar Agarwalla and Santosh Agarwalla, were not included in paragraph 2 of the application. He submits that, since this Court's order dated 8.10.2024 directed the office to substitute the deceased with the legal heirs listed in paragraph 2, the names of these two legal heirs were not substituted.

Indisputably, in the order dated 8.10.2024, we held that all the legal heirs of Lakshmi Narayan Agarwalla need to be substituted.

Given this situation, let the two legal heirs who were left out and should have been incorporated in paragraph 2, also be substituted in place of the deceased employee, along with the other legal heirs.

Office is directed to act accordingly.

Liberty is granted to the learned advocate appearing for the application to amend the cause title of the application for substitution.

Mr. Roy informs us that in connection with the three contempt applications, three review petitions have also been filed along with application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act.

In view thereof, list the matter for further consideration 3 (three) weeks after the vacation in the daily supplementary list of this Court.

In the meantime, the parties would be at liberty to exchange their affidavits to the application under Section 5 of the Limitation Act filed in connection with the review applications.

(Partha Sarathi Chatterjee, J.) (Tapabrata Chakraborty, J.)