

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE**

Present:

The Hon'ble Justice Debangsu Basak

And

The Hon'ble Justice Prasenjit Biswas

FMA 1088 of 2025

With

IA No.: CAN 1 of 2025

Abidar Mallick

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Ors.

For the Appellant : Mr. Shahan Shah, Advocate
Mr. Umenun Khan, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Jaharlal De, Ld. AGP
Mr. Shamim ul Bari, Advocate

Hearing & Judgment on : July 29, 2025

DEBANGSU BASAK, J.:-

1. Appeal is at the behest of the writ petitioner and directed against an order dated May 7, 2025 passed in WPA 8942 of 2025.
2. By the impugned order, learned Single Judge disposed of the writ petition without granting any relief to the appellant.
3. Learned Advocate appearing for the appellant submits that, the private respondent uploaded a video on a social media platform making defamatory allegations as against the appellant. Appellant registered a police complaint. Police are not taking steps to take down that video uploaded in the social media platform.

4. State is represented.
5. Writ petition of the appellant is in relation to an allegedly defamatory video relating to the appellant uploaded in the social media platform by the private respondent.
6. Appellant require the police to take down the offending video as the appellant lodged a police complaint and complain of police inaction citing the failure to do so.
7. According to the State, there is no order of Court authorizing the police to take down the allegedly offending video.
8. There does not exist any order of any Court of competent jurisdiction requiring the police to take down the offending video. Therefore, question of police inaction does not arise. A Writ Court need not enter the arena of the disputes between the private parties relating to the video.
9. In any event, if the appellant is of the view that the contents of the video uploaded by the private respondent on a social media platform is defamatory in nature, the appellant is not remediless. Appellant did not pursue his remedies.
10. Since the appellant did not avail of any remedies relating to the so-called defamatory content of the video concerned, we are not minded to extend any further assistance to the appellant.
11. We find no ground to interfere in the present appeal.

12. **FMA 1088 of 2025** and **IA No.: CAN 1 of 2025** are **dismissed** without any order as to costs.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

13. I agree.

(AD)

(Prasenjit Biswas, J.)