D/L.05.
November 27, 2026.
KAUSHIK

WPA No. 6279 of 2026

Raja Ghosh
Vs.
Bidhannagar Municipal Corporation & Anr.

Mr. Dipanjan Sinha Roy
Mr. Animesh Samanta
… for the petitioner

Mr. Anish Kumar Mukherjee
… for the BMC

1. Affidavit of Service, as filed, be kept with the record.
2. Briefly, the case of the writ petitioner is that the writ petitioner wants to erect an iron structure on the rooftop inside the compound wall for use as an advertisement. As there is no specific and prescribed format, he filed a representation on 20 March, 2025, but the same remains unaddressed.
3. Learned advocate appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that, for his personal benefit, he intends to erect an iron structure for advertising purposes. As the same is commercial in nature, he intends to obtain sanction. However, as there is no specific provision or prescribed format

available with the concerned Municipal Corporation, he has been compelled to submit a representation, which was received by the authority on 20 March, 2025. The grievance of the writ petitioner can be redressed if such representation is considered.

4. The learned advocate appearing on behalf of BMC, in his usual fairness, submits that the policy with regard to the installation or construction of an iron rod structure for advertising purposes in a private area has not been properly taken up by the BMC to date, but the same is under consideration.

5. After considering the submissions of the respective parties, this Court is of the opinion that this writ petition can be disposed of by directing respondent no. 2 to consider the representation dated 20 March, 2025, within twelve weeks from the date of communication of this order, after affording an opportunity of hearing to all necessary and interested parties, and to pass a reasoned order. The order so passed shall be

communicated to the parties two weeks thereafter.

6. Hence, the writ petition stands disposed of without any order as to costs.
7. However, this Court makes clear that it has not addressed the merits of the case. The respondent No. 2 is at liberty to consider the representation independently and strictly in accordance with the law.
8. As the affidavits have not been called for by the parties, the allegations in the writ petition are deemed denied.
9. Parties to act on the basis of the server copy of this order.
10. Urgent: certified photostat server copy of this order to be supplied to the parties upon compliance with all necessary formalities.

(Atarup Banerjee, J.)