Form No. J(2)

In the High Court at Calcutta
Constitutional Writ Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

Present: The Hon'be Justice Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya
And
The Hon'ble Justice Sandip Kumar De

W.P.L.R.T. 200 of 2026

Debabrata Pal and another
Vs.
The State of West Bengal and others

For the petitioners	:	Mr. Bibekananda Tripathi
For the State	:	Mr. Nilanjan Bhattacharjee, SSC Ms. Jayita Dhar Chakraborty, JGA Mr. Saikat Dey
Heard on	:	14.10.2026
Judgment on	:	14.10.2026

Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.:-

1. Affidavit-of-service filed in court today be kept on record.

2. The petitioners' predecessor Prabodh Chandra Pal, along with other co-owners, relying on a "Nirupan Patra", sought for

recording of their names in the records of rights, which was initially turned down.

3. The matter went up via appeal to the West Bengal Land Reforms and Tenancy Tribunal which, vide judgment dated January 11, 2019, directed *status quo ante* to be maintained and, in effect, directed the records to be corrected on the strength of the said Nirupan Patra in favour of the petitioners' predecessor-in-interest Prabodh Chandra Pal as well as his other co-sharers.

4. Subsequently, a challenge was preferred against the Tribunal's order, upon which this court set aside the order and sent the matter back on remand.

5. An SLP was preferred against the same which met with success, thereby setting aside the order of this court and affirming the order of the Tribunal.

6. In consonance with the same, the petitioners subsequently approached the respondent authorities with a representation to record their names as heirs of Prabodh Chandra Pal, pursuant to the direction of the Tribunal.

7. Alleging inaction on the part of the respondent authorities in delaying the disposal of such representation, an original application was filed, bearing O.A. 390 of 2026 (LRTT), which was disposed of by the present impugned order dated March 10,

2026, whereby the learned Tribunal dismissed the original application on the ground that instead of merely making a representation, an appropriate application in prescribed format ought to have been filed by the petitioners for mutation of their names, granting leave to the petitioners to file such application.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in view of the earlier direction of the Tribunal, which was affirmed up to the Hon'ble Supreme Court, this is not a case of mutation but a compliance of the said direction by recording the names of the petitioners.

9. Learned Senior Standing Counsel submits that in view of the petitioners claiming by virtue of inheritance through Prabodh Chandra Pal, one of the beneficiaries of the direction of the Tribunal dated January 11, 2019, this is a fit case where an application for mutation in prescribed format ought to have been filed by the petitioners.

10. At this juncture, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners, in the meantime, have actually filed an application in prescribed format for mutating their names as heirs of the said Prabodh Chandra Pal.

11. A prayer is made for the said application to be directed to be disposed of expeditiously.

12. In view of the aforesaid submission and taking into consideration the facts of the case, we do not find any reason to interfere with the impugned order.

13. Accordingly, WPLRT 200 of 2026 is disposed of without interfering with March 10, 2026 but directing the respondent no. 4, that is, the Block Land and Land Reforms Officer, Nandigram-1 to dispose of the application for mutation filed by the petitioners as expeditiously as possible, preferably within December 24, 2026, by mutating the names of the petitioners subject to compliance of all due formalities otherwise.

14. There will be no order as to costs.

15. Urgent certified copies of this judgment, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.)

I agree.

(Sandip Kumar De, J.)

AD-17

AK