

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
[CIRCUIT BENCH AT PORT BLAIR]

WPA/169/2026

Shri Snehamoy Dey

Vs

The Andaman and Nicobar Administration and others

Ms. G. Mini

... for the petitioner

Ms. Babita Das

... for the Administration

April 21, 2026

[SR]

Item No.14

1. Learned counsel appearing for the writ petitioner submits that the writ petitioner purchased 200 sq. mtrs of land out of a particular plot, being Plot No.142/2/P.
2. Upon the petitioner coming to know about the proposed acquisition of the said property along with other adjacent plots of land, the petitioner wrote to the respondent-authorities seeking compensation if such acquisition takes place. Since there was no reply to such communication, given in the year 2020, a legal notice was served by the petitioner in the year 2021.
3. Subsequently, only on September 18, 2023, the petitioner was intimated that the petitioner's land had not been acquired. The petitioner, upon seeking information under the Right to Information Act, came to know that an award had already been passed, which reflected that the lands in the adjoining areas to the petitioner's land had been acquired for a glide path, upon which thirteen persons had been given compensation and three persons had been omitted, on the ground that the lands of the latter persons were not acquired.

4. Subsequently, the petitioner sought for demarcation of his plot of land before the Tehsildar. Since the Tehsildar sat tight over the matter, the petitioner had to approach the writ court and obtain a direction to that effect. Subsequently, upon there being non-compliance of the court's order, a contempt application was filed, in which an affidavit of compliance was filed by the alleged contemnor, an official of the respondent-authorities, from which it transpired that some portion of the concerned plot still remain unacquired. According to the petitioner, the unacquired land is more than 200 sq. mtrs. In area. Accordingly, the petitioner claims that either the petitioner ought to be returned her land or adequate compensation is to be paid to the petitioner.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, apart from taking the Court through the documents annexed to the writ petition, also places reliance on an order dated March 12, 2026 passed in WPCRC 1 of 2026, where a coordinate Bench, sitting in contempt jurisdiction, had recorded that spot inspection had to be conducted and a report of the spot inspection, with specific finding as regards the share of the petitioner in the subject plot of land, shall be formally communicated to the petitioner. On such observation, the contempt proceeding was dropped with the further finding that it would be open for the petitioner to challenge the finding of the Tehsildar, if the petitioner is aggrieved by the same.

6. However, it is submitted that no report of spot inspection, let alone any specific finding as regards the share of the

petitioner in the subject plot, was ever communicated to the petitioner. Thus, the petitioner has approached this Court seeking remedy with regard to her 200 sq. mtrs plot of land.

7. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent-authorities seeks an opportunity to file affidavit-in-opposition to bring on record the relevant facts and documents. Accordingly, the respondents are directed to file their affidavit-in-opposition within four weeks from date. Reply thereto, if any, shall be filed within a week thereafter.

8. Liberty to the parties to mention the matter for enlistment before the next available Circuit after the aforesaid time-frame for filing of affidavits is over.

(Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.)