

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Criminal Revisional Jurisdiction

Before:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jay Sengupta

CRR 2788 of 2025
CRAN 1 of 2025

Joydeep Biswas
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

For the Petitioner	:	Mr. Soumya Nag, Mr. Rajdeep Sengupta, Mr. Karan Prasad.
For the State	:	Mr. Debasish Roy Id.PP., Mr. Soumya Basu Roy Chowdhuri, Ms. Debarati Das.
For the OP No.2	:	Mr. Aditya Tiwari, Mr. Moyukh Majumder.
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.3250 of 2023 pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Barasat, North 24 Parganas arising out of Baguiati Police Station Case No.417 dated 22.09.2022 under Sections 498A/406/506 of the Indian Penal Code.

2. Report filed on behalf of the State is taken on record.
3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the accused petitioners submits as follows. The petitioner is the sole accused in this case. He is the former husband of the de facto complainant. During pendency of the proceeding, a settlement and compromise has been arrived at between the private parties of all disputes that had led to the registration of an FIR. In fact, upon a prayer made by the both the parties, a mutual divorce was awarded in September, 2024. As such, the proceeding may be quashed on the ground of compromise.
4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the de facto complainant/opposite party supports the contentions of the petitioner and submits that all disputes that had led to the initiation of the impugned proceeding have been settled between the private parties.
5. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the State relies on the report and the case diary and submits as follows. In a further statement made by the alleged victim/de facto complainant before the police, she had clearly stated that a compromise and settlement had been arrived at between the private parties and a decree of divorce on mutual consent was awarded on 10.09.2024. The de facto complainant did not want to proceed with the matter anymore. There is no injury report present in the case diary.
6. It appears that a settlement and compromise has indeed been arrived at between the private parties of all disputes that had led to the initiation of the impugned proceeding.

7. In view of the above and in the interest of justice, I quash the impugned proceeding on the ground of compromise and settlement.

8. The revisional application and the connected application being CRAN 1 of 2025 are, accordingly, disposed of.

9. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order may be supplied to the parties expeditiously, if applied for.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)

Sl. 05/NB