

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CRIMINAL REVISIONAL JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE

The Hon'ble **JUSTICE BIBEK CHAUDHURI**

CRR 2199 of 2022

Sk. Rahim

-Vs-

The State of West Bengal

For the Appellant: Mr. Navanil De,
Ms. Srinjan Ghosh,
Mr. Subhrajit Dey.

For the State: Mr. Anwar Hossain, Jr. Govt. Adv.,
Mr. Joydeep Roy, Jr. Govt. Adv.,
Mr. Pratick Bose,
Md. Kutubuddin,
Ms. Manisha Sharma,
Ms. Sujata Das,
Mr. Navanil Dey.

Heard on: July 11, 2022.

Judgment on: July 11, 2022.

BIBEK CHAUDHURI, J. : –

1. The instant revision arises out of an application for expeditious disposal of Contai Police Station Case No.337 dated 6th October, 2018 under Sections 448/342/325/326/307/376/511/427/506/34 of the IPC and adding Sections 365/368 of the IPC. The above mentioned police case gave rise to GR Case No.1242 of 2018 and Sessions Case No.88 of 2021 pending before the learned Additional Sessions Judge Fast Track, 2nd Court at Contai, Purba Medinipur.

2. On perusal of the averment made in the application and having heard the learned Advocate for the petitioner this Court is of the view that the instant revision can be disposed of with the assistance of the learned Advocate for the state here and now. Therefore, Mr. Joydeep Roy, learned Advocate is requested to assist this Court on behalf of the prosecution. Appointment of Mr. Joydeep Roy learned Advocate be regularized by the learned Legal Remembrancer, Government of West Bengal

3. It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that the alleged date of occurrence was on 4th October, 2018. The defacto complainant lodged FIR against the petitioner on 6th October, 2018. The case was committed to the court of Sessions on 10th March, 2021. There are in all 14 accused persons. The instant petition is filed by Sk. Rahim, one of the accused of the above mentioned case. The learned court below could not frame charge against the accused persons because of the absence of all or any of the accused persons in the trial court on the date of framing of charge. On 26th September, 2022 date is fixed for consideration of charge.

4. In view of the above factual position it is premature to pass any direction for consideration of charge.

5. For the reasons stated above, I do not find merit in the instant revision and accordingly the revision is dismissed on contest, however, without cost.

(Bibek Chaudhuri, J.)