

September 8, 2023
AD 13
Court No.14
SG

WPA 19431 of 2023

Kaushik Das
vs.
The State of West Bengal and others

Ms. Rajashree Tah
... for the petitioner

Mr. Jayanta Samanta
Ms. Bratati Pramanick
Mr. Rajdeep Adhikari
... for the State

Affidavit of service filed in Court is taken on record.

It appears that the notice on the private respondent could not be served as the door was locked. But, an intimation was served.

A report filed by the State is also taken on record.

Learned advocate for the petitioner submits as follows. The petitioner is the owner of a nursing home. He had engaged the private respondent to look after the accounts of the business as a manager. In course of this, the private respondent defalcated a sum of Rs.8.59 lakhs approximately. After much persuasion, Rs.2 lakh was given back. He promised to give rest amount within 10 days. After that he became non-traceable. An FIR has been lodged, but no step taken by the police.

Learned counsel for the State relies on the report and submits as follows. A notice was served on the de facto complainant, but he did not have time to respond. However, raids have been made to apprehend the

accused. He has absconded. The de facto complainant has to cooperate with the investigation.

So far as the accused is concerned, the police shall be at liberty to pray for issuance of warrant of arrest and thereafter, take further steps in this regard.

The investigating officer shall investigate the case expeditiously and in accordance with law.

With these observations, the writ petition is disposed of.

Urgent certified copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties upon compliance of all requisite formalities.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)