

15.7.2026
SL No. 2
Ct No. 42
SB

CRR 2716 of 2017

CRAN 1 of 2026 (withdrawal)

Koushik Das @ Rajdeep Das & Ors.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Anr.

Mr. Amarendra Chakraborty ... for the petitioners

1. The instant application, being CRAN 1 of 2026, has been preferred by the petitioners seeking formal withdrawal of the main criminal revisional application, registered as C.R.R. No. 2716 of 2017.
2. While the petitioners are duly represented by their learned counsel, Mr. Amarendra Chakraborty, none appears to represent either the State of West Bengal or the private opposite party no. 2, Sri Ujjal Kumar Sen, despite administrative notices having been served in this long-pending matter of 2017.
3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that during the pendency of this revisional application, investigative developments have progressed and a police report (charge-sheet) has been filed before the jurisdictional Magistrate. In view of these subsequent changes in circumstances, the petitioners do not wish to press the instant revisional

petition at this stage. Instead, they seek leave to withdraw this application with liberty to challenge the newly filed charge-sheet or take appropriate legal recourse before the trial court, should the need arise.

4. To appreciate the context of the petitioners' prayer, a brief reference to the foundational facts of the case is necessary. The main revisional petition was filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, praying for the quashing of the proceedings in connection with **Duttapukur Police Station Case No. 640 of 2017 dated 26.07.2017** under Sections 419, 420, 406, 384, 506, and 120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, currently pending before the Learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Barasat, North 24 Parganas.
5. The criminal action was set in motion on the basis of a written complaint lodged by the private opposite party no. 2, Sri Ujjal Kumar Sen. The allegations in the First Information Report (FIR) are grave. They outline a systematic web of deception spun by petitioner no. 1, Koushik Das alias Rajdeep Das, who allegedly masqueraded as a High Court Advocate and an influential Public Prosecutor (P.P.).
6. According to the de facto complainant, the petitioners preyed upon his family's vulnerability when they were entangled in a matrimonial dispute under Section 498A of the IPC. It is alleged that:

The petitioners initially extracted ₹2,00,000/- under the pretext of securing bail.

Subsequently, petitioner no. 1, acting in active conspiracy with the other petitioners, coerced the complainant into signing blank papers and extracted an astronomical sum of ₹15,10,000/- across various dates in 2015, promising to secure ₹50,00,000/- through a fabricated defamation suit against the complainant's wife.

When the complainant realized he was being defrauded and demanded his money back, the petitioners allegedly threatened his life, abused his family in filthy language, and warned him of dire consequences.

7. The petitioners had moved this Court in 2017 primarily on the grounds that the dispute had a civil colour, that similar allegations had been investigated in other cases (such as Madhyamgram P.S. Case No. 538 of 2016), and that the entire story was inherently improbable.
8. Under the scheme of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the filing of a charge-sheet marks a watershed moment in a criminal investigation. It signifies that the investigating agency, after evaluating the materials collected under Chapter XII, has found a *prima facie* case warranting a trial.

9. Once a charge-sheet has been submitted, the very substratum of a petition challenging the initial FIR under Section 482 undergoes a fundamental change. The court's focus shifts from the mere assertions in the complaint to the concrete evidentiary material collected by the police. Consequently, any sweeping determination on the merits of the case at this stage, without analyzing the charge-sheet and its accompanying documents, would be premature and counterproductive to the administration of criminal justice.

10. The prayer made by the petitioners to withdraw the present application to address the subsequent developments before the appropriate forum is entirely logical, legally sound, and does not suffer from any perversity or attempt to abuse the process of law. Rather than keeping a dormant petition alive on the docket of this Court, it is in the interest of justice that the petitioners are allowed to seek their remedies in light of the completed investigation.

11. In view of the submissions made on behalf of the petitioners and taking into consideration the change in circumstances brought about by the filing of the charge-sheet, the prayer for withdrawal is allowed.

12. The criminal revisional application, being **C.R.R. No. 2716 of 2017**, is **dismissed as withdrawn** with liberty to the petitioners to file afresh or challenge the charge-

sheet/proceedings in accordance with law before the appropriate forum, if so advised.

13. The connected application, being **CRAN 1 of 2026**, is accordingly **disposed of**.

14. Any interim order passed in connection with this revisional application stands **vacated**.

15. There shall, however, be no order as to costs.

(Uday Kumar, J.)