

03-07-2023
Subha
Item no. 125
Ct no.34

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Criminal Revisional Jurisdiction

CRR 2352 of 2023

Rumali Sahoo & Ors.
-versus-
Smt. Amrita Das Pattanayak

Mr. Biswajit Manna
.....for the petitioners.

Petitioners have challenged the proceedings on the ground that they do not come within the ambit of the relations as has been defined under the relevant provisions of P.W.D.V Act, 2005.

According to Mr. Manna, learned advocate appearing for the petitioners they are the family members of the landlord who have been falsely implicated in the instant case. The petitioners were definitely served with the notice pursuant to which they had the knowledge of initiation of C. R Case No. 424 of 2020.

In view of the statutory provisions relating to the appeal under Section 29 of the P.W.D.V Act, 2005, I direct that the petitioners would prefer their appeal before the learned Sessions Judge and the learned Sessions Judge would consider the validity of the order by virtue of which the process/summons/notice were issued upon the present petitioners.

In case the petitioners are required to file any application for condonation of delay, the pendency of the present revisional application as well as the date of knowledge in respect of the case

should be taken into consideration by the learned District and Sessions Judge while disposing of such application for condonation of delay. .

With the aforesaid observations, the present revisional application being CRR 2352 of 2023 is disposed of.

Pending applications, if any, are consequently disposed of.

All concerned parties are to act in terms of a copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this court.

Urgent Photostat certified copy of this order, if applied for, be given to the parties on completion of usual formalities.

[Tirthankar Ghosh, J]