

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA

Criminal Revisional Jurisdiction

Before:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jay Sengupta

C.R.R. 1440 of 2020

CRAN 1 of 2020

Chiranjit Mondal & Ors.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Anr.

For the Petitioners : Mr. Samrat Chowdhury.

For the State : Mr. Saswata Gopal Mukherjee, Ld PP,
Mr. Imran Ali.

For the Opposite Party No.2. : Mr. Debarshi Bhrahma,
Mr. Ritesh Pal.

Heard on : 22.12.2020

Judgement on : 22.12.2020

Jay Sengupta, J. :

1. This is an application seeking quashing of a proceeding in which a charge sheet was submitted under Sections 406 and 498A of the Penal Code.

2. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows.
The petitioners are the husband and the other in-laws of the opposite party no.2/de facto complainant. During pendency of the impugned proceeding a compromise and settlement was arrived at between the private parties of all disputes that had led to the registration of the First Information Report. The husband and wife have filed for divorce. A reference is made to paragraphs 6 and 7 of the joint compromise application.
3. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the de facto complainant/victim submits as follows. A compromise and settlement has indeed been arrived at between the accused and the victim of all disputes that had led to the commencement of the present case. A joint compromise application has also been filed in this regard. In the interest of justice, the impugned proceeding ought to be quashed on the ground of compromise and settlement.
4. A report filed by the investigating officer of the case incorporating a letter sent to him by the de facto complainant about the purported compromise and settlement as filed on behalf of the State is taken on record.
5. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the State refers to the case diary and submits that the State would not come in the way if a compromise and settlement is arrived at between the private parties.

6. I have heard the submissions of the learned Counsels appearing on behalf of the parties and have perused the revision petition, the case diary and the report filed by the investigating officer.
7. It appears that a compromise and settlement has indeed been arrived at between the accused/petitioners and the de facto complainant/victim of all disputes that had led to the initiation of the impugned proceeding.
8. In view of the above and in the interest of justice, I quash the impugned proceeding on the ground of compromise and settlement arrived at between the private parties.
9. With these observations, the revisional application and the connected applications are disposed of.
10. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order may be supplied to the parties expeditiously, if applied for.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)