9
15.10.2026
Court No. **652**
D.Hira

WPA 29603 of 2026

Surajit Samanta & Anr.
Vs.
West Bengal State Electricity Distribution Company Limited & Anr.

Mr. Sukumar Ghosh,
Ms. Moumita Ghosh.
... for the petitioners

Mr. Srijan Nayak,
Ms. Rituparna Maitra.
... for the WBSEDCL

1. The petitioners have challenged an order of the District Magistrate, Purba Medinipur dated August 7, 2026, which was passed pursuant to this Court's order dated March 10, 2026.

2. The petitioners' grievance as to the said impugned order is firstly, that the order is an unreasoned one and secondly, that the petitioners have not given any opportunity of hearing by the District Magistrate, while passing the said order.

3. Parties are represented.

4. It is learnt from the submissions of the respective parties that the case has a long drawn chequered history.

5. Upon failed attempts being made as many as for three occasions due to the non-cooperation and resistance of the private respondents, the respondent authority has finally been able to put up a transformer on the land vested to the State, which is now recorded in the name of the Government. The said transformer is now operational.

6. The petitioners apprehend threat and hazard due to the proximity of their plot of land to the said transformer.

7. So the respondent was resisted and the parties pursued their rights before this Court through writ petitions.

8. The writ petition being WPA No. 11623 of 2025 was one of such writ petition by the present petitioners in which, the Court ultimately directed the District Magistrate to decide in accordance with law after hearing all the parties. The resultant order is that dated August 7, 2026, which is impugned in the instant writ petition.

9. So far as the grievance of the petitioners as against the said impugned order as stated above, both of those are found unsustainable in view of the fact that the order of the District Magistrate is eloquently reasoned upon finding the technical and safety standards being duly maintained while installing the transformer. It is also apparent that the petitioners were present with their learned advocate during hearing. Hence the allegation of not affording any opportunity of hearing to them is also unsustainable.

10. Considering as above, this Court does not find any cogent reason to interfere into the order of the District Magistrate which he has passed in terms of this Court's previous order.

11. Accordingly, the present writ petition amounts to be meritless.

12. Hence, **WPA No. 29603 of 2026** is **dismissed**.

13. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance with all requisite formalities.

(Rai Chattopadhyay, J.)