

**WPA/15801/2026**  
**BADKULLA ANCHAL LARGE-SIZED COOPERATIVE  
AGRICULTURAL CREDIT SOCIETY LTD.  
VS.  
STATE OF WEST BENGAL AND ORS.**

Mr. Soumyadip Biswas, Adv.  
Mr. Vijay Verma, Adv.

...For the Petitioner

Mr. Tapas Kr. Chatterjee, Adv.  
Ms. Smita Pal, Adv.

...For the Respondent Nos.1&2/State

Mr. D.N. Roy, G.P.  
Ms. Madhu Jana, Adv.  
Ms. Madhurima Basu, Adv.

...For the Respondent Nos.3&4

Mr. Niladri Saha, Adv.

...For the Co-operative  
Election Commission

1. The parties are represented by their respective learned counsel.
2. Affidavit-of-service filed by the writ petitioner in Court today is taken on record.
3. In the instant writ petition a notification dated 23.06.2026 as issued by the Respondent No.2 is impugned. By the impugned notification, the Respondent No.2 authority removed the Board of Administrators consisting of three members and appointed a new Administrator in place and stead of previously appointed Board of Administrators for a particular period in the interest of the society with

the direction that the new Administrator shall take appropriate steps under the supervision, direction and control of the Co-operative Election Commission, West Bengal ('Commission' in short) for constituting elected management of the co-operative society during his tenure.

4. Such appointment is challenged by the co-operative society being the writ petitioner herein.
5. At the time of hearing, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the writ petitioner, submits before this Court that there cannot be any occasion to remove the earlier Board of Administrators and to appoint a new Administrator pursuant to section 35 of the West Bengal Co-operative Societies Act, 2006 ('Act of 2006' in short). It is argued that section 35 of the Act of 2006 contemplates that no Board shall be superseded or kept under suspension for a period exceeding six months. Since the impugned notification contravenes the provision of section 35 of the Act of 2006 the writ petitioner is entitled to the relief/reliefs as prayed for.
6. Learned advocate appearing for the Respondent authorities, however, supported the impugned notification.
7. On careful perusal of the impugned notification it reveals that the Respondent No.2 authority removed the earlier Board of Administrators which has been

appointed by the selfsame authority and instead one Administrator has been appointed with some designated purpose as mentioned in the impugned order.

8. Learned counsel for the writ petitioner on being asked repeatedly, however, could not satisfy this Court as to how appointment of the present Administrator would hamper the election of the Board members of the said society, especially when such election is being supervised and conducted as per direction and control of the Respondent No.5, Commission. The writ petitioner-society could not ventilate that on account of issuance of such notification a fundamental right and/or constitutional right and/or any legally enforceable right of the writ petitioner has been infringed.
9. This Court, thus, finds no reason to interfere with the notification dated 23.06.2026.
10. The instant writ petition is devoid of merit and is, accordingly, **dismissed**.
11. No order as to costs.

**(PARTHA SARATHI SEN, J.)**