OD- 1

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
ORIGINAL SIDE

WPO/446/2026

MANASHI DAS
VS
THE KOLKATA MUNICIPAL CORPORATION AND ORS

BEFORE
THE HON'BLE JUSTICE RAJA BASU CHOWDHURY
Date: 19th November, 2026

Appearance:
Mr. Aloke Chatterjee, Adv.
Mr. Arghya Mullick, Adv.
for the petitioner

Mr. Bishwajit Mukherjee, Adv.
Mr. Kaushik Dey, Adv.
for the Kolkata Municipal Corporation

Mr. Sirsanya Bandopadhyay, Adv.
Mr. Rahul Kumar Singh, Adv.
Mr. Md Danish Farooqui,, Adv.
...for the respondent nos. 9 to 11.

1. The present writ petitioner has been filed inter alia praying for a direction upon the municipal authorities to demolish the illegal construction made at the behest of the respondent nos. 8 to 11 and the failure on the part of the municipality authorities to consider the representation of the petitioner dated 12th August, 2026.

2. When the matter was taken up for consideration on 6th October, 2026 this Court had directed the learned Counsel appearing for the municipality to take appropriate instructions as regards location of the premises No. 132A and 132A/1, Ganapati Sur Sarani (formerly South Sinthi Road), Kolkata – 700050.

3. On 13th October, 2026 the Municipality had filed a report duly countered signed by the Executive Engineer (Civil), Building Department, Borough – I, Kolkata Municipal Corporation as regards the location of the aforesaid

two premises. Thereafter on 12th November, 2026 the matter was adjourned so as to enable the learned Counsel for the municipality to take appropriate instructions in the matter especially as to whether any illegal construction had been taken place at the locale.

4. Today the municipality has filed a report duly countersigned by the Executive Engineer (Civil), Building Department, Borough – I, Kolkata Municipal Corporation dated 17th November, 2026.

5. Mr. Dey, learned advocate appearing for the municipality by placing before this Court the above report would submit that the municipality has duly inspected the aforesaid premises on 17th November, 2026. It was noted that there exist a partly three-storeyed old building and partly single-storeyed old RT shed structure and no new construction has been found.

6. In view of the disclosure as aforesaid I am of the view no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the writ petition in the file.

7. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed.

(RAJA BASU CHOWDHURY, J.)

gb