

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Criminal Revisional Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

Present:
The Hon'ble Justice Jay Sengupta

CRR 47 of 2025
Aparna Banerjee
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Anr.

For the Petitioner	: Mr. Rakesh Roy
For the State	: Mr. Anand Keshri Mr. Mainak Gupta
For the o.p. no. 2	: Mr. Jayanta Kumar Mondal
Heard on	: 28.10.2025
Judgment on	: 28.10.2025

Jay Sengupta, J.:

This is an application praying for an expeditious hearing of G.R. No. 278 of 2002 arising out of Haripal P. S. case No. 39 dated 11.05.2002 under Sections 406, 420, 120B, 468, 471 and 109 of the Indian Penal Code presently pending before the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate at Chandannagar.

Affidavit of service filed on behalf of the petitioner is taken on record.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits as follows. The FIR in this case was lodged in 2002. Charge sheet was

submitted in 2005. The matter has remained pending for no fault of the present petitioner. In 2017 the petitioner prayed for discharge. The same is still pending and has not been decided yet. In the interest of justice, the proceeding may be expedited.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits as follows. This is a case involving chit fund and money marketing. Some accused are still absconding. Efforts are being made to procure their attendance. This and certain other unforcible eventualities caused the delay in the proceeding. However, the jurisdictional Court shall be at liberty to split up the proceeding and proceed against the appearing accused.

Heard the learned counsels for the parties.

It appears that there has been an inordinate delay in concluding the proceeding. Although the FIR was lodged in 2002 and the charge sheet was submitted in 2005, till date even the petitioner's application for discharge filed in 2017 has not been decided.

In view of the above and in the interest of justice, the learned jurisdictional Court is directed to expedite the proceeding and if necessary split up the proceeding between the appearing accused and the accused who are absconding and more particularly, decide the question of discharge of the present petitioner as expeditiously as

possible, preferably within three months from the date of communication of this order.

With these observations and directions, the revisional application is disposed of.

Urgent Photostat certified copy of this judgment be supplied to the parties, if applied for, as early as possible.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)

tbsr/1