

Form No. J(2)

***IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CRIMINAL REVISIONAL JURISDICTION***

Present:

The Hon'ble Justice Jay Sengupta

C.R.R. 890 of 2020

Bijay Rai

-vs-

Puspa Rai & Ors.

For the Petitioner : Mr. Kaustav Mitra,
Mr. Bhusan Jain

For the State : Mr. Anwar Hossain,
Mr. M. F. A. Begg

Heard on: 03.03.2021

Judgment on: 03.03.2021

Jay Sengupta, J.:

This is an application seeking an expeditious disposal of a complaint case under Sections 120B, 420, 467, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. The petitioner is the complainant in this case. In spite of the fact that the petition of complaint was lodged in 2017, till date proceeding could not be concluded.

Even charges have not yet been framed. At least one of the accused/opposite parties is a very aged person. It will be in the interest of justice for all that the proceeding is concluded at the earliest. Long dates are being fixed before the learned trial court. No steps have been taken by the learned trial court to expedite the matter in spite of a previous direction passed by this Court on 09.04.2019 in CRR 866 of 2019. On 14.02.2020 a warrant of arrest had to be issued against the accused. The proceeding has remained pending for no fault of the present petitioner.

Learned counsel for the State submits that it will be in the interest of justice if an order is passed to expedite the proceeding.

I have heard the submissions of the learned counsels appearing on behalf of the petitioner and the State and have perused the revision petition.

No prejudice will be caused to anyone if a direction for an expeditious disposal of the proceeding is passed in this case.

It appears that some delay has been occasioned in concluding the proceeding. This is despite an order passed

by this Court earlier directing expeditious disposal of the proceeding.

In view of the above and in the interest of justice, I request the learned court to conclude the proceeding as expeditiously as possible without granting any unnecessary adjournment to any of the parties and in the event charges have not yet been framed, decide the question of framing of charge at the earliest, preferably within the period of three months from the next date of hearing.

With these observations, the revisional application is disposed of.

Urgent photostat certified copy of the order, if applied for, be given to the parties, upon usual undertakings.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)