

September 17, 2024
18 ARDR

CRR 2936 of 2024

Swarnali Saha
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & ors.

Adv. Debangana Bhattacharya,
Adv. A. Ghatak,
Adv. T. Dhali,
Adv. B. Khatun,
Adv. J. Bhattacharya,
Adv. D. Sanyal,
Adv. R. Sreemani,
Adv. M. Islam,
Adv. P. Bhattacharya,

for the petitioner.

Adv. Kallol Mondal,
Adv. Anamitra Banrjee,
Adv. Subhojyoti Bag,

...for the O.P.2.

Adv. Arindam Jana,
Adv. Subhajyoti Bandopadhyay,
Adv. Bani Israil,

...for the O.P. nos. 3 to 5.

Inadvertent error has crept into the order passed on 10th
September, 2024.

The second paragraph of the first page of the order is corrected as
hereunder:-

“The petitioner who is the de facto complainant in the Sessions
Case no. 45 of 2024 pending before the learned Additional Sessions
Judge, 1st Court, Sealdah, 24 Parganas (South) has assailed the
order passed on 12th June, 2024 insofar as the learned trial Court
has framed charges against accused/private opposite party nos.2,3
and 4 under Sections 498A/34 of the Indian Penal Code and against
all the accused/private opposite parties under Sections
506/509/341/323/ 354/354C/313/34 of the Indian Penal Code and
Sections 66/67A of the I.T. Act.”

Also, in the penultimate paragraph of the 2nd page of the order the sentence “The learned Trial Court is directed to frame charges under Sections 354D/406 of the Indian Penal Code, Section 5 of the MTP Act, 1971 and Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act against the accused opposite parties in addition to Sections 506/509/341/323/ 354C/313/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 66/67A of the IT Act” be deleted and the following sentence be incorporated:

“The learned trial Court is directed to frame charges under Sections 354D/406 of the Indian Penal Code, Section 5 of the MTP Act, 1971 and Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act against the accused/opposite parties in addition to Sections 506/509/341/323/ 354C/313/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 66/67A of the IT Act (against all the accused persons) and Section 498A/34 (against accused/private opposite party nos. 2,3 and 4)”.

The remaining portion of the order shall remain unaltered.

(Suvra Ghosh, J.)