

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Criminal Revisional Jurisdiction

Before:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jay Sengupta

CRR 1947 of 2025
CRAN 1 of 2025

Karan Mohta & Ors.
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Sabir Ahmed, Mr. Swapan Nath, Ms. Shreyasi Nath.
For the State	:	Mr. Debashish Roy, Mr. Kunal Ganguly, Mr. Sobhan Gani.
For the De facto Complainant	:	Mr. Raghav Joshi, Ms. Paulomi Dutta.
Heard on	:	04.08.2025
Judgement on	:	04.08.2025

Jay Sengupta, J. :

1. This is an application praying for quashing of a proceeding being CGR Case No.3541 of 2024 arising out of Alipore Police Station Case No.126 dated 23.12.2024.
2. Affidavit of service filed on behalf of the petitioners is taken on record.

3. A report filed on behalf of the State containing a copy of the statement of the de facto complainant/alleged victim on 29.07.2025, as filed in Court, is taken on record.
4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the accused petitioners submits that the accused petitioners and the de facto complainant/opposite party had settled the disputes that had led to the registration of an FIR. As such, they are praying for quashing of the impugned proceeding on the ground of compromise.
5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the de facto complainant, who is present in Court, supports such contentions of the petitioners and submits that the proceeding may be quashed on the ground of settlement and compromise.
6. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the State relies on the case diary and the subsequent statement of the victim and submits as follows. There is no injury report present in the case diary. It appears from the subsequent statement given by the de facto complainant before the police that she did not want to proceed with the matter as a settlement was arrived at between the private parties. The State would not come in the way if the private parties decide to settle the matter.
7. In view of the fact that there is a settlement and compromise arrived at between the private parties, there is a subsequent statement of the victim to such effect and that there is no injury report present in the case diary, I am inclined to allow the application for quashing.

8. Accordingly, the impugned proceeding is quashed on the ground of compromise and settlement.
9. The application being CRAN 1 of 2025 is, accordingly, disposed of.
10. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order may be supplied to the parties expeditiously, if applied for.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)

Sl. 09/NB