

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Criminal Revisional Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

Present:
The Hon'ble Justice Jay Sengupta

CRR 2676 of 2025
With
CRAN 1 of 2025

Susmita Mondal nee Das & Ors.
Vs.
State of West Bengal & Anr.

For the Petitioners	: Mr. Sourav Basu
For the O.P. 2	: Mr. Arindam Sen Mr. Bidan Modak
For the State	: Mr. Anand Keshri Mr. Santanu Talukdar
Heard on	: 29.08.2025
Judgment on	: 29.08.2025

Jay Sengupta, J.:

This is an application for quashing of proceeding in G.R. Case No. 2034 of 2024 pending before the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Uluberia, Howrah arising out of Amta P.S. Case No. 178 dated 02.09.2024 under Sections 329(4), 117(2), 324(4), 351(2) and 3(5) of the BNS.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the accused petitioners submits that compromise and settlement has been arrived at between

the private parties of all disputes that had led to the registration of an FIR. As such, the impugned proceeding may be quashed. In fact, there is a settlement arrived at in respect of a counter case as well.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the de-facto complainant supports the contentions of the petitioners and submits that in view of the settlement and compromise arrived at between the private parties, the impugned proceeding may be quashed.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State relies on the case diary and on the report filed, which is taken on record, and submits as follows. It appears that a settlement and compromise has indeed been arrived at between the private parties. In a subsequent statement made by the de-facto complainant, he has clearly stated that if the accused are exonerated from this case, he would not have any objection. There is no injury report present in the case diary.

It appears that a settlement and compromise has been arrived at between the private parties of all disputes that had led to the initiation of the impugned proceeding.

In view of the same and in the interest of justice, the impugned proceeding is quashed on the ground of settlement.

The revisional application is disposed of.

Accordingly, CRAN 1 of 2025 also stands disposed of.

The personal appearance of the Investigating Officer is noted and is dispensed with.

Urgent Photostat certified copy of this judgment be supplied to the parties, if applied for, as early as possible.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)

tbsr/10