

In the matter of:- Sanatan Ghosh

...petitioner

Mr. Prosenjit Mukherjee,
Mr. Arghya Kamal Das,
Ms. Poulami Dutta.
...for the petitioner.

Mr. Imran Ali,
Mr. Md. Kutubuddin.
...for the State.

Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner would not like to press the prayer for quashing and would instead pray for expediting the proceeding.

Let a copy of this application be served upon Mr. Imran Ali and Mr. Md. Kutubuddin, learned Counsels who ordinarily appear on behalf of the State. Let them represent the State. Their engagement may be regularised by the competent authority of the State in due course.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits as follows. The FIR was lodged on 26.02.2015 and a charge sheet was also submitted in 2015. Till date, not a single witness could be examined in this case. Although the charges were framed in 2018, the present proceeding has remained pending for no fault of the present petitioner.

Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits that the State would not come in the way if a direction 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.

On the prayer of the learned Counsel for the petitioner, the revisional application is dismissed as not pressed so far as the prayer for

quashing is concerned.

However, the learned Trial Court is requested to conclude the proceeding 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.

With the above 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.)