

S/L Item No.-1  
**28.08.2026**  
Court No. 3  
Rohan

**In the High Court at Calcutta  
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction  
Appellate Side**

**WPA 23316 of 2026**

**All India Trinamool Congress  
Versus  
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Mr. Kishore Datta, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Agnish Basu  
Mr. Vipul Vedant  
Mr. Gourav Bose  
Mr. Aditya Roy

... for the Petitioner

Mr. Surajit Nath Mitra, Ld. AG  
Mr. Samrat Mukherjee  
Mr. Arghya Chatterjee  
Mr. Subhranil Ray

... for the State

Mr. Billwadal Bhattacharyya, Ld. AAG  
Mr. Biswajit Mukherjee

... for the K.M.C.

Mr. Jaydeep Kar, Sr. Adv.  
Mr. Rudraman Bhattacharyya, Sr. Adv.  
Ms. Amrita Panja Moulick  
Mr. Satyaki Mukherjee

... for the Intervener

1. Pursuant to leave granted by the Hon'ble the Acting Chief Justice on 27<sup>th</sup> August, 2026, the instant writ petition has been filed today and upon notice, the matter was directed to be listed in the Daily Supplementary List and has been taken up for consideration.
2. At the very outset, Mr. Bhattacharyya, learned Additional Advocate General has raised an objection as

regards impleadment of the respondent Nos. 4 to 12 in their personal capacity, though, the above persons are discharging official duties. Having heard the learned advocates for the respective parties, let the individual names of the parties holding the respective posts be deleted from the array of respondents in the present petition.

3. Accordingly, the department is directed to amend the cause title insofar as the respondent Nos. 4 to 12 are concerned.
4. It also appears that the State of West Bengal has not been appropriately served. Service on the State of West Bengal has been directed to be made through the learned Government Pleader, High Court at Calcutta. This Court does not appreciate the same. Accordingly, leave is granted to the petitioner's advocate on-record to correct the cause title of the writ petition in so far as the respondent No. 1 is concerned.
5. The petitioner is directed to cause fresh service on all the other respondents.
6. By the instant writ petition, the petitioner seeks to challenge the steps taken by the authorities in purporting to remove the petitioner's *nameboard* situated at 9, Camac Street, Kolkata, 700 017 pursuant to the impugned order and/or notice.

7. Mr. Datta, learned Senior Advocate representing the petitioner has drawn the attention of this Court to communication dated 27<sup>th</sup> August, 2026 addressed to the Officer-in-Charge, Shakespeare Sarani Police Station and the order passed by authorities. He would submit that the Municipal authorities have proceeded to pass an order and execute the same in extraordinary haste. According to him, when the writ petition was filed, the order by then had already been executed. In the peculiar facts, he would insist that the respondents should restore petitioner's *nameboard* situated at 9, Camac Street, Kolkata, 700017. He would also insist that this Court should direct the respondents to disclose, identify and furnish to the petitioner and produce before this Court a complete list containing the names, designations and official affiliation of all officers, officials and personnel of Kolkata Municipal Corporation and/or any other civic authority who were present and participated in the impugned action at premises No. 9, Camac Street, Kolkata, 700017 as also for a direction to identify and furnish a list containing the names and designation of the official affiliations of all police officials and personnel who were present and/or participated in the impugned action. He would submit that the petitioner is interested to proceed against these persons in their individual capacity.

8. In support of the aforesaid contention, reliance has been placed on paragraph Nos. 15 to 21 of the writ petition.
9. Mr. Bhattacharyya, learned Additional Advocate General assisted by Mr. Mukherjee learned advocate, would submit that the petitioner is not entitled to any interim order, far to speak of grant of any final order at the interim stage.
10. It is submitted that since the respondents were not appropriately arrayed as parties, he needs some more time to take proper instructions in the matter.
11. Mr. Samrat Mukherjee, learned Advocate appears for the State.
12. Mr. Kar, learned Senior Advocate is interested to intervene in the matter on behalf of his client Piramo Investors Ltd. having its office at 24, Ballygunge Park, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Kolkata, 700019. He claims that the aforesaid Piramo Investors Ltd. are the owners of premises No. 9, Camac Street, Kolkata, 700017 and as such, he is entitled to a notice of the instant proceedings. It is still further submitted that a complaint was lodged by the proposed intervener as regards the illegal hoarding set up by the petitioner at the locale. No permission was sought for from the owners before setting up the said hoarding.

13. Having heard the learned advocates appearing for the respective parties, I find that the petitioner is aggrieved by the act and action of the Municipal authority purporting to remove the *nameboard* of the petitioner situated at 9, Camac Street, Kolkata. I also note that on the basis of the submissions made by the petitioner's learned Senior Advocate that the petitioner's *nameboard* has already been removed, as such, in my view, there is no scope to afford any interim protection to the petitioner at this stage. Though the petitioner would insist for restoration of the *nameboard*, I find that it is too premature to seek for such a prayer. The same would tantamount to granting of a final relief at an interim stage which is not permissible in law.

14. Insofar as the petitioner's prayer for disclosure of the names of the Municipal officials and the police officials are concerned, I find that the petitioner places reliance on the statements made in paragraph Nos. 15 to 21 of the petition. Incidentally, such statement have not been affirmed as either true to knowledge or derived from the records, which the deponent considers to be verily true. In fact, in the affidavit affirmed by one Mr. Subhasish Chakraborty, in his capacity as the authorised representative of the petitioner, it has been stated that the statements made in paragraph Nos. 1 to 9 of the petition are true to knowledge and/or based

on information derived from records which he verily believed to be true. No particulars of such record have been disclosed. Further the statements made in paragraphs 15 to 21 are only submissions. In the peculiar facts, this Court is not inclined to place reliance on such statements. As such no order directing disclosure of particulars as sought for can be passed.

15. This apart, although the petitioner would insist that in the peculiar facts, when the Municipal authorities have taken steps in hot haste, an order of injunction should at least be passed restraining the Municipal authorities from taking any steps in respect of premises No. 9, Camac Street, Kolkata, 700017. As regards such contention, I find that there is no cause of action at present for the petitioner to seek for such a relief. No statement to support such cause is available. Mere submission cannot entitle the petitioner to such blanket order. It is also well settled that an order cannot be passed on the basis of mere apprehension. None has taken responsibility for the diverse factual details, and serious factual allegations, they have only been passed off as submissions. In the peculiar facts, I am not inclined to grant such relief.

16. The petitioner is directed to complete service on all the respondents as directed above.

17. The respondents shall be at liberty to use affidavit in opposition within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of the writ petition. The petitioner shall be at liberty to file a response to the same on or before the matter is taken up next.
18. Liberty to mention for early hearing after expiry of the period for exchange of affidavits.
19. Insofar as Mr. Kar's client's right to intervene is concerned, such issue is not decided at this stage since the Municipal authorities are yet to file a response.
20. It is made clear that since initially the municipality was not represented, this Court directed the Additional Advocate General and Mr. Mukherjee, learned advocate, who usually appears for Kolkata Municipal Corporation, to appear on their behalf. Let their appointments be regularised.

***(Raja Basu Chowdhury, J.)***