

ORDER SHEET  
IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA  
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION  
ORIGINAL SIDE

EC/7/2025

SHILADITYA BANERJEE AND ORS  
VS  
THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL

BEFORE:

The Hon'ble JUSTICE BISWAROOP CHOWDHURY

Date: 11<sup>th</sup> September, 2025.

**APPEARANCE:**

*Mr. Rajarshi Dutta, Adv.*  
*Mr. Sabyasachi Sen, Adv.*  
*...for the decree holder Nos. 1 to 3.*

*Mr. Pranit Bag, Adv.*  
*Mr. Ramanuj Roy Chowdhury, Adv.*  
*...for added party/decree holder No. 4.*

*Mr. Paritosh Singh, Adv.*  
*Mr. Arindam Mandal, Adv.*  
*Ms. Swagata Ghosh, Adv.*  
*...for the respondent.*

The Court : Learned Advocates for the decree holder no. 1, decree holder no. 2, decree holder no. 3 and decree holder no. 4 are present. Mr. Sinha, learned Advocate on behalf of the State of West Bengal is also present.

Heard learned Advocates for the parties.

It appears that by an order dated 1<sup>st</sup> May, 2025, the judgment debtor-opposite party was restrained from operating its bank account maintained with Reserve Bank of India, B.B.D Bag, Kolkata in the name of Land Acquisition Collector's account requisitioned B/A A/c. no. 29 without setting apart a sum of Rs.13,94,03,711/-. Thereafter, the notice was issued upon the judgment

debtor. On the prayer of the learned Advocate for the judgment debtor, the matter was adjourned to obtain necessary orders from the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

It is submitted by the learned Advocates that the special leave petition which was filed against the order of the Hon'ble Division of this Court is already dismissed. Learned Advocate for the judgment debtor-State relies upon the copy of the order and submits that the said special leave petition is not dismissed on merits but on the grounds that the Hon'ble Court has not invoked the extraordinary jurisdiction for the grounds stated in the said order. Learned Advocate also submits that his client intends to file a review application.

Upon perusal of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, this Court is of the view that once the special leave petition is disposed of, there are no grounds for this Court to further adjourn this execution case.

It is prayed for by the learned Advocates for the decree holder nos. 1, 3 and 4 that payment be made to the decree holders by the Reserve Bank of India and it is suggested by Mr. Sinha, learned Advocate appearing for the State that the payment be made subject to the condition that they shall keep in a separate account the amount received and not liquidate the same for a period twelve weeks, to enable the judgment debtor to file a review petition. This Court is of the view that in the interest of justice, there should be a direction upon the Reserve Bank of India to make payment of Rs.6,01,48,874/- each to both decree holder no. 1- Mr. Shiladitya Banerjee and decree holder no. 4- Ms. Arundhati Chatterjee. Such sums upon being received from the

Reserve Bank of India by the decree holder nos. 1 and 4 and upon being invested in any account of a nationalised bank shall not be liquidated for a period of eight weeks from the date of such receipt without the leave of this Court.

With regard to the decree holder no. 3, the Reserve Bank of India is directed to keep separately Rs.6,01,48,874/- in a separate account and shall not operate the said account without the leave of this Court.

As technical point is raised by the judgment debtor, although the decree holder no. 3 is made a party to this execution case, liberty is granted to the decree holder no. 3 to take out a formal application with regard to the direction of payment.

Let this matter appear on 11<sup>th</sup> November, 2025

(BISWAROOP CHOWDHURY, J.)