

In the matter of:- Sunil Kumar Das @ Sunil Das & Ors. ...
petitioners

Mr. Swapan Kumar Mallick,
Mr. Tarun Kumar Ghosh,
Ms. Suvasree Ghosh.
...for the petitioners.

Mr. Anwar Hossain,
Ms. Sujata Das.
...for the State.

Although this is an application praying for quashing of a proceeding under Sections 3, 4, 5 and 7 of the Immoral Trafficking Act and Sections 370 read with Section 120B of the Penal Code, learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that the petitioners would not like to press the application and would like to pray for an expeditious disposal of the proceeding.

Let a copy of this application be served upon Mr. Anwar Hossain and Ms. Sujata Das, 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 appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits as follows. The petitioners are the accused in this case. The present case was started on 01.01.2016. The petitioners are on bail. However, in spite of a passage of about six years only four witnesses out of a total of eight witnesses could be examined in this case. In fact, rest of the witnesses are police personnel. In the interest of justice, a direction may be passed to expedite the proceeding.

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 petitioners and the State and have perused the revision petition.

On the prayer of the learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners, the prayer for quashing of the proceeding made on behalf of the petitioners is rejected as not pressed.

It appears that some delay has been occasioned in concluding the trial, especially considering the fact that the FIR was lodged way back in 2016.

In view of the above and in the interest of justice, the learned Court is requested 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.

The merits of the case have not been gone into.

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.)