

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Criminal Revisional Jurisdiction

Before:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jay Sengupta

CRR 2546 of 2025
CRAN 1 of 2025

Subhradeep Chowdhury & Ors.
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Srinjoy Das
For the State	:	Mr. Arijit Ganguly, Mr. Arup Sarkar.
For the De facto Complainant	:	Mr. Arvind Kr. Singh
Heard on	:	01.09.2025
Judgement on	:	01.09.2025

Jay Sengupta, J. :

1. This is an application praying for quashing of a proceeding being GR Case No.630 of 2025 pending before the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bolpur arising out of Bolpur Police Station Case No.181 dated 16.04.2025 under Sections 126(2), 117(2), 303(2), 324(4), 351(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

2. Affidavit of service filed on behalf of the petitioners is taken on record.
3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the accused petitioners submits as follows. During pendency of the proceeding, the disputes that had led to the registration of an FIR have all been finally settled and compromised between the accused petitioners and the de facto complainant/opposite party. As such, the proceeding may be quashed on the ground of settlement and compromise.
4. Such contention is supported by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the de facto complainant.
5. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the State relies on the case diary and strongly opposes the prayer for quashing on the ground of settlement and compromise. He submits that there are other persons who are the victims of the alleged offences. They have not been made parties. It has not even been alleged that a settlement and compromise was arrived at involving all of them. The case diary shows inflicting of serious injuries. A charge sheet has now been submitted under Sections 126(2), 117(2), 303(2), 324(4), 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS.
6. It appears that all the victims of this case have not even been made parties, far less any compromise supposedly arrived at involving them.
7. In view of the above, I do not find any merit in this application.
8. Accordingly, the prayer for quashing of proceeding on the ground of compromise and settlement is rejected.

9. The revisional application and the connected application being CRAN 1 of 2025 shall stand disposed of, accordingly.
10. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order may be supplied to the parties expeditiously, if applied for.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)

Sl. 03/NB