WBCHCA0563632026

Item No.8
Ct. No.1
KS

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE

M.A.T. 1866 of 2026
+
I.A. No. CAN 1 of 2026

Santoshpur More Durgotsav Samiti, Puja Committee & Anr.
Versus
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Appearance:
Mr. Arka Kr. Nag
Mr. S. Ray
Ms. Shrobona Sengupta
Mr. Kaushik Bandopadhyay .....Advocates for Appellants

Mr. Billwadal Bhattacharyya, Ld. A.A.G.
Mr. Anish Kr. Mukherjee
Mr. Tamoghna Pramanick
.....Advocates for State

CORAM: RAVINDRA VITHALRAO GHUGE,
CHIEF JUSTICE
&
OM NARAYAN RAI, J.
Date: 15.10.2026

Order (Per Court)

1. We have considered the submissions of the learned advocate for the Appellants, in the light of the grounds (I to XXXVI).

2. *Prima facie*, we find that the Appellants/Petitioners, before us, have an internal dispute/squabble between the members of the Appellant No.1/Samiti, which is an unregistered organisation.

3. Learned advocate for the Appellants submits that the State Government gives funds for erection of a Pandal to organize the Durga Puja. We are circumspect as to how the funds collected from the taxpayers money, can be offered to an organization, which is not registered under any statute.

4. The learned Additional Advocate General submits that he is not aware as to whether any such funds are given to the Appellants since, this was not pleaded, either before the learned Single Judge or even before this Court.

5. We have perused the reasoned order passed by the learned Single Judge. The consideration of the submissions of the parties are reflected in Paragraphs 5 to 8. We find that the learned Single Judge has drawn a plausible conclusion. Merely because a different view could be possible, would not mean that the order of the learned Single Judge could be branded as being perverse or erroneous.

6. In view of the above, **we do not find any merit in the Appeal and the same is, therefore, dismissed**.

(OM NARAYAN RAI, J.) **(RAVINDRA V. GHUGE)**
Chief Justice