

In the matter of:- Rajendra Kumar Gupta

...petitioner

Ms. Devipriya Mitra.
...for the petitioner.

Ms. Sukanya Bhattacharyya,
Md. Kutubuddin.
...for the State.

This is an application seeking expeditious disposal of a proceeding in which a charge sheet was submitted under Sections 406, 419, 467, 468, 471 and 474 read with Section 120B of the Penal Code.

Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. Although the case was started as far back as in 1996 and a charge sheet was submitted in 1999, till date the proceeding could not be concluded. Even the application of the petitioner under Section 239 of the Code praying for discharge is pending. On some pretext or the other, the proceeding lingered on. The proceeding has largely remained pending for no fault on the part of the present petitioner.

Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits that at this stage it would not be required to find out actually who was primarily responsible for the delay. In the interest of justice, the proceeding ought to be expedited.

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

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

It appears that an inadvertent delay has been occasioned in

concluding the impugned proceeding.

In view of the above and in the interest of justice, I request the learned Trial Court to conclude the proceeding as expeditiously as possible without granting any unnecessary adjournment to any of the parties and in particular, to decide the question of framing of charge at the earliest, preferably within a period of three months from the next date of hearing.

With these observations, the revisional application is disposed of.

Urgent photostat certified copy of this order may be supplied to the parties expeditiously, if applied for.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)