

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Criminal Revisional Jurisdiction
APPELLATE SIDE**

Present:

The Hon'ble Justice Shampa Dutt (Paul)

CRR 745 of 2020

Mr. Mohan Dhara & Ors.

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Anr.

For the Petitioners : Mr. Pawan Kr. Gupta,
Ms. Sofia Nesar,
Mr. Santanu Sett.

For the State : Mr. Arijit Ganguly,
Ms. Debjani Sahu.

For the Opposite Party No. 2 : Mr. Subimal Ghorai.

Heard on : 03.07.2023

Judgment on : 18.07.2023

Shampa Dutt (Paul), J.:

1. The present revision has been preferred against an order dated 20.02.2017 and the proceeding in connection with Kotwali Police Station Case No. 870 of 2013 dated 05.11.2013 under Sections 498A/315/109 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, which was registered on Kotwali Police Station **Charge Sheet** No. 241 of 2015 dated 09.03.2015 under Sections

498A/315/109 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, now pending as G.R. Case No. 3636 of 2013, before the Learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sadar Court, Paschim Medinipore.

2. The petitioners' case is that the opposite party no. 2/wife in her written complaint alleged that the petitioners being the husband and in-laws of the opposite party no. 2 have committed serious matrimonial torture upon her and have forced her to pay dowry. It was further alleged that petitioner no. 1 tried to destroy her advanced stage pregnancy.
3. The petitioners submit that the marriage between the opposite party no. 2 and the petitioner no. 1 was solemnized on 12.12.2012 as per Hindu Rites and Customs. Since the opposite party no. 2 was not willing to reside with the joint family, the petitioner no. 1 for the purpose of maintaining peace was residing separately with the opposite party no. 2 as husband and wife at Golapi Chowk, P.S. Kotwali, Paschim Medinipore.
4. After arrival at the new rented house, the opposite party no. 2 started misbehaving with the petitioner no. 1 and time and again put the petitioner under severe difficulties as there was much interference by the family of the opposite party no. 2.
5. The petitioners state that the petitioners are completely innocent and in no way connected with the commission of any offence far less the offences alleged herein. It is evident from the nature of hollow allegations in the written complaint that the instant proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide. The petitioners no. 2 and 3 never resided with

the opposite party no. 2 and the allegations as made in the written complaint are blatant lie.

6. Opposite party no. 2 besides filing of this false complaint has also reported the incident to the office of the petitioner no. 1, whereby, a disciplinary proceeding was started against him. Opposite party no. 2 has also filed case under Section 125 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 and is enjoying the maintenance from the salary of the petitioner no. 1. Opposite party no. 2 is residing separately at her parental house and in conspiracy with her paramour is creating trouble in the life of the petitioners.
7. Sachinandan Dhara, father of the petitioner no. 1 has expired on 05.08.2015.
8. **Mr. Pawan Kr. Gupta, learned counsel for the petitioners** has submitted that the entire proceeding is bad in law and is not maintainable in the eye of law and that the Learned Magistrate erred in not considering that the petitioners are completely innocent and in no way connected with the commission of any offences far less the offences alleged herein and they bear clean antecedent. The opposite party no. 2 has initiated the instant proceedings which is palpably frivolous and vexatious in nature and the same is initiated in order to harass and humiliate the present petitioners.
9. **Mr. Subimal Ghorai, learned counsel for the opposite party no. 2** has submitted that the trial in this case should be permitted to proceed as the proceeding is in accordance with law.

10. **Mr. Arijit Ganguly, learned counsel for the State** has placed the case diary.
11. **From the materials on record and the case diary**, it appears that the de facto complainant/wife lived with her husband, (the petitioner no. 1) separately from her in-laws, petitioner no. 2 (mother-in-law) and petitioner no. 3 (brother-in-law).
12. **The injury report dated 18.11.2013 shows the injury after the alleged assault as “A small abrasion found over Rt palm”.**
13. **From the order dated 26.11.2013 of the trial Court, it appears that the de facto complainant has delivered a healthy baby.**
14. In ***Kahkashan Kausar @ Sonam & Ors. vs. State of Bihar & Ors., 2022 LiveLaw (SC) 141***, the Supreme Court held as follows:-

“Issue Involved

11. *Having perused the relevant facts and contentions made by the Appellants and Respondents, in our considered opinion, the foremost issue which requires determination in the instant case is whether allegations made against the in-laws Appellants are in the nature of general omnibus allegations and therefore liable to be quashed ?*

12. *Before we delve into greater detail on the nature and content of allegations made, it becomes pertinent to mention that incorporation of section 498A of IPC was aimed at preventing cruelty committed upon a woman by her husband and her in-laws, by facilitating rapid state intervention. However, it is equally true, that in recent times, matrimonial litigation in the country has also increased significantly and there is a greater disaffection and friction surrounding the institution of marriage, now, more than ever. This has resulted in*

an increased tendency to employ provisions such as 498A IPC as instruments to settle personal scores against the husband and his relatives.

13. This Court in its judgment in **Rajesh Sharma and Ors. Vs. State of U.P. & Anr;** (2018) 10 SCC 472, has observed:-

“14. Section 498-A was inserted in the statute with the laudable object of punishing cruelty at the hands of husband or his relatives against a wife particularly when such cruelty had potential to result in suicide or murder of a woman as mentioned in the statement of Objects and Reasons of the Act 46 of 1983. The expression 'cruelty' in Section 498A covers conduct which may drive the woman to commit suicide or cause grave injury (mental or physical) or danger to life or harassment with a view to coerce her to meet unlawful demand. It is a matter of serious concern that large number of cases continue to be filed under already referred to some of the statistics from the Crime Records Bureau. This Court had earlier noticed the fact that most of such complaints are filed in the heat of the moment over trivial issues. Many of such complaints are not bona fide. At the time of filing of the complaint, implications and consequences are not visualized. At times such complaints lead to uncalled for harassment not only to the accused but also to the complainant. Uncalled for arrest may ruin the chances of settlement.”

14. Previously, in the landmark judgment of this court in **Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar and Anr;** (2014) 8 SCC 273, it was also observed:-

“4. There is a phenomenal increase in matrimonial disputes in recent years. The institution of marriage is greatly revered in this country. Section 498-A IPC was introduced with avowed object to combat the menace of harassment to a woman at the hands of her husband and his relatives.

The fact that Section 498-A IPC is a cognizable and non-bailable offence has lent it a dubious place of pride amongst the provisions that are used as weapons rather than shield by disgruntled wives. The simplest way to harass is to get the husband and his relatives arrested under this provision. In a quite number of cases, bed-ridden grandfathers and grandmothers of the husbands, their sisters living abroad for decades are arrested.”

15. Further in *Preeti Gupta & Anr. Vs. State of Jharkhand & Anr;* (2010) 7 SCC 667, it has also been observed:-

“32. It is a matter of common experience that most of these complaints under section 498A IPC are filed in the heat of the moment over trivial issues without proper deliberations. We come across a large number of such complaints which are not even bona fide and are filed with oblique motive. At the same time, rapid increase in the number of genuine cases of dowry harassment are also a matter of serious concern.

33. The learned members of the Bar have enormous social responsibility and obligation to ensure that the social fiber of family life is not ruined or demolished. They must ensure that exaggerated versions of small incidents should not be reflected in the criminal complaints. Majority of the complaints are filed either on their advice or with their concurrence. The learned members of the Bar who belong to a noble profession must maintain its noble traditions and should treat every complaint under section 498A as a basic human problem and must make serious endeavour to help the parties in arriving at an amicable resolution of that human problem. They must discharge their duties to the best of their abilities to ensure that social fiber, peace and tranquility of the society remains intact. The members of the Bar should also ensure that one complaint should not lead to multiple cases.

34. Unfortunately, at the time of filing of the complaint the implications and consequences are not properly visualized by the complainant that such complaint can lead to insurmountable harassment, agony and pain to the complainant, accused and his close relations.

35. The ultimate object of justice is to find out the truth and punish the guilty and protect the innocent. To find out the truth is a herculean task in majority of these complaints. The tendency of implicating husband and all his immediate relations is also not uncommon. At times, even after the conclusion of criminal trial, it is difficult to ascertain the real truth. The courts have to be extremely careful and cautious in dealing with these complaints and must take pragmatic realities into consideration while dealing with matrimonial cases. The allegations of harassment of husband's close relations who had been living in different cities and never visited or rarely visited the place where the complainant resided would have an entirely different complexion. The allegations of the complaint are required to be scrutinized with great care and circumspection.

36. Experience reveals that long and protracted criminal trials lead to rancour, acrimony and bitterness in the relationship amongst the parties. It is also a matter of common knowledge that in cases filed by the complainant if the husband or the husband's relations had to remain in jail even for a few days, it would ruin the chances of amicable settlement altogether. The process of suffering is extremely long and painful.”

16. In Geeta Mehrotra & Anr. Vs. State of UP & Anr; (2012) 10 SCC 741, it was observed:-

“21. It would be relevant at this stage to take note of an apt observation of this Court recorded in the matter of **G.V. Rao vs. L.H.V. Prasad & Ors. reported in**

(2000) 3 SCC 693 wherein also in a matrimonial dispute, this Court had held that the High Court should have quashed the complaint arising out of a matrimonial dispute wherein all family members had been roped into the matrimonial litigation which was quashed and set aside. Their Lordships observed therein with which we entirely agree that:

“there has been an outburst of matrimonial dispute in recent times. Marriage is a sacred ceremony, main purpose of which is to enable the young couple to settle down in life and live peacefully. But little matrimonial skirmishes suddenly erupt which often assume serious proportions resulting in heinous crimes in which elders of the family are also involved with the result that those who could have counselled and brought about rapprochement are rendered helpless on their being arrayed as accused in the criminal case. There are many reasons which need not be mentioned here for not encouraging matrimonial litigation so that the parties may ponder over their defaults and terminate the disputes amicably by mutual agreement instead of fighting it out in a court of law where it takes years and years to conclude and in that process the parties lose their “young” days in chasing their cases in different courts.” The view taken by the judges in this matter was that the courts would not encourage such disputes.”

17. Recently, in **K. Subba Rao v. The State of Telangana**, (2018) 14 SCC 452 it was also observed that:-

“6. The Courts should be careful in proceeding against the distant relatives in crimes pertaining to matrimonial disputes and dowry deaths. The relatives of the husband should not be roped in on the basis of omnibus allegations unless specific instances of their involvement in the crime are made out.”

18. *The above-mentioned decisions clearly demonstrate that this court has at numerous instances expressed concern over the misuse of section 498A IPC and the increased tendency of implicating relatives of the husband in matrimonial disputes, without analysing the long term ramifications of a trial on the complainant as well as the accused. It is further manifest from the said judgments that false implication by way of general omnibus allegations made in the course of matrimonial dispute, if left unchecked would result in misuse of the process of law. Therefore, this court by way of its judgments has warned the courts from proceeding against the relatives and in-laws of the husband when no prima facie case is made out against them.”*

And finally the court held:-

“22. *Therefore, upon consideration of the relevant circumstances and in the absence of any specific role attributed to the accused appellants, it would be unjust if the Appellants are forced to go through the tribulations of a trial, i.e., general and omnibus allegations cannot manifest in a situation where the relatives of the complainant’s husband are forced to undergo trial. It has been highlighted by this court in varied instances, that a criminal trial leading to an eventual acquittal also inflicts severe scars upon the accused, and such an exercise must therefore be discouraged.”*

- 15.** The Supreme Court in ***M/s Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. Vs. The State of Maharashtra & Ors., (on 13 April, 2021), in Criminal Appeal No. 330 of 2021***, citing several precedents held :-

“ * * * * *

iv) The power of quashing should be exercised sparingly with circumspection, as it has been observed, in the 'rarest of rare cases (not to be confused with the formation in the context of death penalty).

vi) Criminal proceedings ought not to be scuttled at the initial stage;

ix) The functions of the judiciary and the police are complementary, not overlapping;

xiii) The power under **Section 482** Cr.P.C. is very wide, but conferment of wide power requires the court to be more cautious. It casts an onerous and more diligent duty on the court;

xiv) However, at the same time, the court, if it thinks fit, regard being had to the parameters of quashing and the self-restraint imposed by law, more particularly the parameters laid down by this Court in the cases of R.P. Kapur (supra) and Bhajan Lal (supra), has the jurisdiction to quash the FIR/complaint;

* * * * *

16. In Ramveer Upadhyay & Anr. Vs State of Uttar Pradesh & Anr.,

Special Leave petition (CRL.) No. 2953 of 2022, on 20.04.2022, the

Supreme Court held :-

“39. In our considered opinion criminal proceedings cannot be nipped in the bud by exercise of jurisdiction under **Section 482** of the Cr.P.C. only because the complaint has been lodged by a political rival. It is possible that a false complaint may have been lodged at the behest of a political opponent. However, such possibility would not justify interference under **Section 482** of the Cr.P.C. to quash the criminal proceedings. As observed above, the possibility of retaliation on the part of the petitioners by the acts alleged, after closure of the earlier criminal case

*cannot be ruled out. The allegations in the complaint constitute offence under the Atrocities Act. **Whether the allegations are true or untrue, would have to be decided in the trial. In exercise of power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., the Court does not examine the correctness of the allegations in a complaint except in exceptionally rare cases where it is patently clear that the allegations are frivolous or do not disclose any offence.***

17. In ***Umesh Kumar Vs State of Andhra Pradesh and Anr. (Supra)*** the Supreme Court **also** held :-

“20. The scope of Section 482 CrPC is well defined and inherent powers could be exercised by the High Court to give effect to an order under CrPC; to prevent abuse of the process of court; and to otherwise secure the ends of justice. This extraordinary power is to be exercised ex debito justitiae. However, in exercise of such powers, it is not permissible for the High Court to appreciate the evidence as it can only evaluate material documents on record to the extent of its prima facie satisfaction about the existence of sufficient ground for proceedings against the accused and the Court cannot look into materials, the acceptability of which is essentially a matter for trial. Any document filed along with the petition labelled as evidence without being tested and proved, cannot be examined. The law does not prohibit entertaining the petition under Section 482 CrPC for quashing the charge-sheet even before the charges are framed or before the application of discharge is filed or even during the pendency of such application before the court concerned. The High

Court cannot reject the application merely on the ground that the accused can argue legal and factual issues at the time of the framing of the charge. However, the inherent power of the Court should not be exercised to stifle the legitimate prosecution but can be exercised to save the accused from undergoing the agony of a criminal trial. (Vide Pepsi Foods Ltd. v. Judicial Magistrate [(1998) 5 SCC 749 : 1998 SCC (Cri) 1400 : AIR 1998 SC 128] , Ashok Chaturvedi v. Shitul H. Chanchani [(1998) 7 SCC 698 : 1998 SCC (Cri) 1704 : AIR 1998 SC 2796] , G. Sagar Suri v. State of U.P. [(2000) 2 SCC 636 : 2000 SCC (Cri) 513] and Padal Venkata Rama Reddy v. Kovvuri Satyanarayana Reddy [(2011) 12 SCC 437 : (2012) 1 SCC (Cri) 603] .)

21. In *Rajiv Thapar v. Madan Lal Kapoor* [(2013) 3 SCC 330 : (2013) 3 SCC (Cri) 158] this Court while dealing with the issue held as follows : (SCC p. 348, para 30)

“30. Based on the factors canvassed in the foregoing paragraphs, we would delineate the following steps to determine the veracity of a prayer for quashment raised by an accused by invoking the power vested in the High Court under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure:

30.1. Step one : Whether the material relied upon by the accused is sound, reasonable and indubitable i.e. the material is of sterling and impeccable quality?

30.2. Step two : Whether the material relied upon by the accused would rule out the assertions contained in the

charges levelled against the accused i.e. the material is sufficient to reject and overrule the factual assertions contained in the complaint i.e. the material is such as would persuade a reasonable person to dismiss and condemn the factual basis of the accusations as false?

30.3. Step three : Whether the material relied upon by the accused has not been refuted by the prosecution/complainant; and/or the material is such that it cannot be justifiably refuted by the prosecution/complainant?

30.4. Step four : Whether proceeding with the trial would result in an abuse of process of the court, and would not serve the ends of justice?"

22. In State of Bihar v. P.P. Sharma [1992 Supp (1) SCC 222 : 1992 SCC (Cri) 192 : AIR 1991 SC 1260] this Court dealt with an issue of whether an application under Section 482 CrPC for quashing the charge-sheet should be entertained before cognizance is taken by a criminal court and held as under : (SCC pp. 269-70, para 68)

"68. ... Quashing the charge-sheet even before cognizance is taken by a criminal court amounts to 'killing a stillborn child'. Till the criminal court takes cognizance of the offence there is no criminal proceedings pending. I am not allowing the appeals on the ground that alternative remedies provided by the Code as a bar. It may be relevant in an appropriate case. My view is that entertaining the writ petitions against charge-sheet and considering the matter on merit in the guise of prima

facie evidence to stand an accused for trial amounts to pre-trial of a criminal trial.... It is not to suggest that under no circumstances a writ petition should be entertained. ... The charge-sheet and the evidence placed in support thereof form the base to take or refuse to take cognizance by the competent court. It is not the case that no offence has been made out in the charge-sheets and the first information report.”

(emphasis supplied)

23. *The issue of mala fides loses its significance if there is a substance in the allegation made in the complaint moved with malice. In Sheonandan Paswan v. State of Bihar [(1987) 1 SCC 288 : 1987 SCC (Cri) 82 : AIR 1987 SC 877] this Court held as under : (SCC p. 318, para 16)*

“16. ... It is a well-established proposition of law that a criminal prosecution, if otherwise justifiable and based upon adequate evidence does not become vitiated on account of mala fides or political vendetta of the first informant or the complainant.”

24. In Parkash Singh Badal v. State of Punjab [(2007) 1 SCC 1 : (2007) 1 SCC (Cri) 193 : AIR 2007 SC 1274] *this Court held as under : (SCC p. 43, para 74)*

“74. The ultimate test, therefore, is whether the allegations have any substance. An investigation should not be shut out at the threshold because a political opponent or a person with political difference raises an allegation of commission of offence. Therefore, the plea of mala fides as raised cannot be maintained.”

25. In State of A.P. v. Golconda Linga Swamy [(2004) 6 SCC 522 : 2004 SCC (Cri) 1805 : AIR 2004 SC 3967] this Court held as under : (SCC p. 529, para 8)

“8. ... It is the material collected during the investigation and evidence led in court which decides the fate of the accused person. The allegations of mala fides against the informant are of no consequence and cannot by themselves be the basis for quashing the proceeding.”

(See also K. Karunakaran v. State of Kerala [(2007) 1 SCC 59 : (2007) 1 SCC (Cri) 251] .)

26. *Thus, in view of the above, it becomes evident that in case there is some substance in the allegations and material exists to substantiate the complicity of the applicant, the case is to be examined in its full conspectus and the proceedings should not be quashed only on the ground that the same had been initiated with mala fides to wreak vengeance or to achieve an ulterior goal.*

27. *The scheme for inquiry/trial provided under CrPC is quite clear. After investigation, report under Section 173(2) CrPC is to be submitted before the competent court i.e. the Magistrate having jurisdiction in the matter and the Magistrate may take cognizance under Section 190 CrPC. However, it is still open to the Magistrate to direct further investigation under the provisions of Section 173(8) CrPC. If the case is triable by the Court of Session, the Magistrate would commit the case to the said court under Section 209 CrPC. **It is for the court to examine***

whether there is sufficient material collected during investigation and filed along with the charge-sheet that a prima facie view can be taken to proceed against the accused and in view thereof, frame charges under Section 228 CrPC. At this stage the remedy available to the accused is to ask for discharge under Section 227 CrPC. In case charges are framed the accused has to face the trial, charges can be added/alterd at any stage of the trial, before the pronouncement of the judgment to suit the evidence adduced before the court, under the provisions of Section 216 CrPC. The only legal requirement is that a witness has to be recalled as provided under Section 217 CrPC when a charge is altered or added by the court.”

18. The Supreme Court in *State of Maharashtra vs. Salman Salim Khan* (2004) 1 SCC-525, also held:-

“12.....In a case praying for quashing of the charge, the principle to be adopted by the High Court should be that if the entire evidence produced by the prosecution is to be believed, would it constitute an offence or not. The truthfulness, the sufficiency and acceptability of the material produced at the time of framing of charge can be done only at the stage of trial.....”

19. The Marriage in the present case took place on 12.12.2012. The opposite party no. 2 filed the present case on 05.11.2013.

20. The opposite party no. 2/wife has alleged offences under Sections 498A/315/109 IPC.

21. Section 498A of the Indian Penal Code, lays down:-

“498A. Husband or relative of husband of a woman subjecting her to cruelty.—Whoever, being the husband or the relative of the husband of a woman, subjects such woman to cruelty shall be punished with imprisonment for a term which may extend to three years and shall also be liable to fine.

Explanation.—For the purpose of this section, “cruelty” means—

(a) any wilful conduct which is of such a nature as is likely to drive the woman to commit suicide or to cause grave injury or danger to life, limb or health (whether mental or physical) of the woman; or

(b) harassment of the woman where such harassment is with a view to coercing her or any person related to her to meet any unlawful demand for any property or valuable security or is on account of failure by her or any person related to her to meet demand.

Ingredients of offence.— The essential ingredients of the offence under Section 498A are as follows:-

- (1) A woman was married;
- (2) She was subjected to cruelty;
- (3) Such cruelty consisted in —
 - (i) Any willful conduct as was likely to drive such woman to commit suicide or to cause grave injury or danger to her life, limb or health whether mental or physical.
 - (ii) Harm to such woman with a view to coercing her to meet unlawful demand for property or valuable security or on account of failure of such woman or any of her relations to meet the lawful demand.
 - (iii) The woman was subjected to such cruelty by her husband or any relation of her husband.”

22. Section 315 of the Indian Penal Code, lays down:-

“315. Act done with intent to prevent child being born alive or to cause it to die after birth.—Whoever before the birth of any child does any act with the intention of thereby preventing that child from being born alive or causing it to die after its birth, and does by such act prevent that child from being born alive, or causes it to die after its birth, shall, if such act be not caused in good faith for the purpose of saving the life of the mother, be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, or with fine, or with both.

Ingredients of offence.— The essential ingredients of the offence under Section 315 are as follows:-

- (1) A woman was quick with child,
- (2) Accused did some act before the birth of the child,
- (3) Accused did so with the intention of preventing the child from being born alive or causing it to die after birth,
- (4) Accused did not act in good faith.”

23. Section 109 of the Indian Penal Code, lays down:-

“109. Punishment of abetment if the act abetted is committed in consequence and where no express provision is made for its punishment.— Whoever abets any offence shall, if the act abetted is committed in consequence of the abetment, and no express provision is made by this Code for the punishment of such abetment, be punished with the punishment provided for the offence.

Ingredients of offence.— The essential ingredients of the offence under Section 109 are as follows:-

- (1) Abetment either by instigation, conspiracy or aiding;

(2) There principal act abetted must have been committed.

There is, however, no express provision in the Code for punishment under the Section.”

24. The materials on record, do not support the contentions of the complainant that the petitioner no. 1 did some act before the birth of the child to cause harm. ‘Cruelty’ as defined under Section 498A IPC is also not prima facie present in this case. Admittedly the petitioners no. 2 & 3 lived separately and away from the complainant and the petitioner no. 1. There is also no ingredients nor prima facie material to show that there was any incident of abetment as alleged.

25. Thus it is seen that the materials in the case diary and the charge sheet there in do not prima facie make out a case of cognizable offence against the accuseds/petitioners and there is no materials for proceeding against the accuseds/petitioners towards trial and this is a fit case where the inherent power of the court should be exercised.

26. The ultimate test therefore, is whether the allegations have any substance (***Prakash Singh Badal Vs State of Punjab, AIR 2007 SC 1274***).

27. In the Present case there is no substance in the allegations and no material exists to prima facie make out the complicity of the petitioners in a cognizable offence, as such the proceedings in this case should be quashed.

28. The revisional application being CRR 745 of 2020 is accordingly allowed.

29. The proceeding being, Kotwali Police Station Case No. 870 of 2013 dated 05.11.2013 under Sections 498A/315/109 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and **Charge Sheet** being No. 241 of 2015 dated 09.03.2015 under Sections 498A/315/109 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Sections 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, now pending as G.R. Case No. 3636 of 2013, before the Learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sadar Court, Paschim Medinipore and all orders therein are hereby quashed in respect of the petitioners Mohan Dhara, Maya Dhara and Hiren Dhara.

30. No order as to costs.

31. All connected applications, if any, stands disposed of.

32. Interim order, if any, stands vacated.

33. Copy of this judgment be sent to the learned Trial Court for necessary compliance.

34. Urgent certified website copy of this judgment, if applied for, be supplied expeditiously after complying with all, necessary legal formalities.

(Shampa Dutt (Paul), J.)