

January 4, 2024
AD 6
Ct. No.14
SG

WPA 24031 of 2023

Prithiraj Khara
vs
The State of West Bengal and others

Mr. B.N. Ray
Ms. Shetparna Ray
... for the petitioner

Mr. Asish Kumar Guha
Mr. Rajendra Chaturvedi
... for the State.

Mr. Sobhan Majumder
Ms. Kalpita Paul
... for the private respondents.

Affidavit of service filed in Court is taken on record.

Learned advocate for the petitioner submits as follows. The petitioner works and resides abroad. He had sent huge sums of money from there to his relatives so that one Radha-Gobinda Mandir could be renovated and property could be purchased in the name of the deity. But, the accused purchased properties in their own names. The petitioner was constrained to file an application under Section 156(3) of the Code as the police did not entertain his complaint. After a direction was passed, an FIR has been registered, but no investigation has been done.

Learned advocate for the private respondents submits as follows. The allegations made in the writ petition are denied. Prior to this FIR the wife of the

petitioner had lodged a similar FIR containing the same allegations. Charge-sheet has been submitted over the same.

Learned advocate for the State relies on the report filed earlier and submits as follows. A charge-sheet has also been submitted on the earlier FIR filed by the petitioner's wife. The present case is also being investigated.

The investigating agency shall be at liberty to find out whether the two FIRs are similar in nature and thereafter, act in accordance with law.

No further order need be passed.

With these observations, the writ petition is disposed of without any costs.

As affidavits were not called for, the allegations made are deemed not to have been admitted.

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

[Jay Sengupta, J.]