

22.05.2025
Item No.20
Ct. No.35
dc.

W.P.A. 10020 of 2025

Atindra Nath Mridha
versus
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

Mr. Ziaul Haque,
Mr. Himadri Kumar Mahata ... For the Petitioner.

Mr. Suman Sengupta,
Ms. Amrita Panja Moulick ... For the State.

Mr. Anindya Halder ... For the private Respondents.

Affidavit-of-service filed in Court today be kept with the record.

Report submitted by the learned advocate appearing for the State be also kept with the record.

The petitioner complains regarding the inaction of the police authorities. However, the records reflect that the petitioner has already invoked the jurisdiction of the learned Magistrate under Section 175(3) of BNSS being M.P. Case No. 10 of 2025.

Having considered that the petitioner has already availed the alternative remedy before the learned ACJM, Basirhat, if the petitioner is dissatisfied with the outcome of the result of the application under Section 175(3) of BNSS, petitioner would be at liberty to approach the revisional court.

Learned advocate for the private respondents is present.

State has submitted a report.

Having considered the prayers of the petitioner and the fact that the petitioner has already availed the alternative remedy, I am not inclined to invoke the jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

In the light of the observations made above, the writ petition being WPA 10020 of 2025 is disposed of.

There will be no order as to costs.

All concerned parties shall act on the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official *website* of this Court.

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

(Tirthankar Ghosh, J.)