

CRR 1569 of 2025

In the matter of:

Subroto Mallicik

... petitioner

Mr. Indradip Pal

... for the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that although the private opposite party was not the legally married wife of the petitioner, the trial court erroneously granted maintenance allowance to the said lady. This was challenged by the petitioner in revision. Among other things, the petitioner relied on documents showing that the opposite party No.1 was receiving unmarried daughter's pension from the Eastern Railways. However, the proceeding is getting unduly protracted, more so, due to the adjournments taken by the State. The State is not at all a relevant party.

As a prayer has been made to expedite the proceeding, no prejudice will be caused to anyone if an order has been passed without serving notice to the other side.

In view of the delay caused, the Sessions Judge is requested to conclude the proceeding in the revision in accordance with law and as expeditiously as possible, without granting unnecessary adjournments to any of the

parties and without considering the State as a necessary party in the proceeding.

However, it shall be open to the revisional Court to issue another notice to the private opposite party.

Accordingly, the revisional application is disposed of.

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

(Jay Sengupta, J.)