

15.12.2025
rc/ct.no.05
Item No.04

WPA No. 9824 of 2025
Buli Bibi
Versus
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Imtiaz Ahmed
Mr. Debapriya Samanta
Mr. S. Palit ..for the Petitioner

Mr. Suman Sengupta
Mr. Sanatan Panjafor the State

Heard learned counsels for the parties.

The petitioner alleges that the police authority is visiting her house at odd hours in the garb of investigation and is torturing her and abusing her in filthy language.

Denying such allegation, learned counsel for the State submits that the police did not visit the house of the petitioner at any point of time. Question of torture or abuse does not arise. Learned counsel submits that one Koyel Mondal lodged complaint before the police authority that she had an affair with one Sahin Parvez who happens to be son of the petitioner. Since the police was informed that Koyel Mondal was residing with Sahin Parvez in the house of the petitioner, the police went there at an appropriate time to record her statement under Section 180 of the BNSS.

It appears that the petitioner is not connected to the complaint lodged by Koyel Mondal in any manner

whatsoever. Whether Koyel Mondal and Sahin Parvez have been residing in the petitioner's house may be ascertained in course of investigation. In the event the police authority requires co operation/ presence of Koyel Mondal in course of investigation, they shall take necessary steps without visiting the house of the petitioner. The police authority shall not visit the house of the petitioner in connection with the FIR lodged by Koyel Mondal.

The writ petition is accordingly disposed of.

There shall, however, be no order as to costs.

Since no affidavit is invited, the allegations contained in the writ petition are deemed not to have been admitted.

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

(Suvra Ghosh,J)