

Item-
14. 10-07-2025

WPA(P) 240 of 2025

Vijay Kumar Singhal

Vs.

The Union of India & Ors.

sg

Ct. 8

Mr. Phiroze Edulji, Sr. Adv.

Ms. Anamika Pandey

Ms. Amrita Pandey

Mr. Ghana Shyam Pandey

Ms. Sneha Singh

Ms. Bipasha Jaiswal

Mr. Supratim Ghose

Ms. Manisha Debdas

...for the petitioner

Mr. Arindam Jana

Ms. Jhuma Sen

Mr. Subrata Ganguly

Mr. Yuvraj Chatterjee

Mr. Rahul Surtani

Mr. Pritish Bandhopadhyay

...for the de-facto/victim

Mr. Nilotpal Chatterjee

Mr. Satyaki Banerjee

...for the Calcutta University

Mr. Abhratosh Majumdar, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Biswaroop Bhattacharya

Mr. Debayan Sen

Mr. Niket Ojha

...for the respondent nos.6-10

Mr. Kumar Jyoti Tewari, Sr. Adv.

Mr. ARijit Majumdar

...for the UOI

Mr. Amajit De, Special PP, CBI

...for the CBI

Mr. Kishore Datta, Ld. AG

Mr. Kalyan Bandopadhyay, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Abhratosh Majumdar, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Biswaroop Bhattacharya

Mr. Swapan Banerjee

Mr. Debanjan Mandal

Mr. Sirsanya Bandopadhyay, Sr. SC

Mr. Sondip Dasgupta

Mr. Arka K. Nag

Mr. Swapan Banerjee

Ms. Sumita Shaw

Mr. D.N. Banerjee

Mr. Soumen Chatterjee

Mr. Debayan Sen

...for the State

1. The petitioner claims to be a Managing Partner of M/s.

VKS & Co., Chartered Accountants and graduate in Law

from Vinoba Bhave University.

2. This public interest litigation has been filed for a direction upon the State Administration to forthwith transfer the investigation of the Kasba Police Station Case to Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI). However, in course of argument, it is stated that the accused persons have been produced before the Magistrate with ropes tied round their waists which is in violation of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in several matters.
3. We are little apprehensive about the bona fide of the petitioner as while there is an accusation of a partial investigation, the petitioner here is now espousing the cause of the accused being ill-treated or their human rights are being violated. We have serious doubt about the bona fide of the petitioner and accordingly, the petition is dismissed.
4. Moreover, the accused persons have been represented by lawyers before the Trial Court and they do not require the voice of the present petitioner to espouse the cause in this proceeding.
5. While the Court would have expected that the so-called public spirited petitioner would be espousing cause of the victim and an impartial and fair investigation, the present petitioner seems to be more concerned about the accused persons as would appear from the submission made on behalf of the writ petitioner. Moreover, a prayer for CBI has been opposed by the victim as the learned Counsel for the victim has clearly submitted on the earlier occasion and even today that the victim has full faith and

confidence in the investigation and is satisfied with the investigation till date.

6. The submission on behalf of the writ petitioner is diametrically opposite to the grounds on which the petitioner seeks CBI investigation of the Kasba Police Case.
7. WPA(P) of 240 of 2025 is dismissed accordingly.

(Soumen Sen, J.)

(Smita Das De, J.)