

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA

Criminal Revisional Jurisdiction

Before:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jay Sengupta

C.R.R. 3391 of 2019

Namita Mal & Ors.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Anr.

For the Petitioners : Mr. Prantick Ghosh,
Mr. Sourav Guha.

For the State : Mr. Imran Ali,
Ms. Manasi Ray.

Heard on : 15.12.2020

Judgement on : 15.12.2020

Jay Sengupta, J. :

1. This is an application seeking expeditious disposal of a proceeding in which a charge sheet was submitted under Section 323 and 498A read with Section 34 of the Penal Code.

2. Let a copy of this application be served upon Mr. Imran Ali who is present in Court and who ordinarily appears on behalf of the State. His engagement may be regularised by the competent authority of the State in due course.
3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits as follows. The petitioners are the accused in this case. Although the First Information Report was lodged in 2016 and the charge sheet was also submitted in the year 2016 itself, till date the proceeding could not be concluded. There are eight prosecution witnesses as mentioned in the charge sheet. The charges were framed in 2017. In spite of these, till date no evidence could be recorded. The proceeding has remained pending for not fault on the part of the present petitioners. Such delay in disposing of the proceeding has taken place in spite of a prior order of this Court passed on 09.08.2018 in CRR 834 of 2018 thereby directing expeditious disposal of the proceeding.
4. I have heard the submissions of the learned Counsels appearing on behalf of the petitioners and the State and have perused the revision petition.
5. No prejudice will be caused to anyone if a direction is passed to expedite the proceeding in question.

6. It appears that some delay has indeed been caused in conducting the proceeding at hand. It is a matter of concern that in spite of framing of charges in 2017, no evidence would be recorded as yet.
7. In view of the above and in the interest of justice, I request the learned Trial Court to conclude the trial as expeditiously as possible without granting any unnecessary adjournment to any of the parties, preferably within a period of one year from the next date of hearing.
8. With these observations, the revisional application is disposed of.
9. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order may be supplied to the parties expeditiously, if applied for.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)