

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Criminal Revisional Jurisdiction
Appellate Side

Present:
The Hon'ble Justice Jay Sengupta

CRR 2902 of 2025

Kashi Nath Ghosh & Anr.
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Anr.

For the Petitioners : Mr. Avitava Bhowmik

For the State : Mr. Suman De
Ms. Suchismita Dutta

Heard on : 06.08.2025

Judgment on : 06.08.2025

Jay Sengupta, J.:

This is an application praying for expeditious conclusion of trial in G.R. Case No. 1081 of 2019 presently pending before the learned Judicial Magistrate, 4th Court, Barrackpore, North 24 Parganas arising out Nimta P.S. Case No. 39 dated 09.02.2019.

Affidavit of service filed on behalf of the petitioners is taken on record.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits as follows. The petitioner no. 1 is the 90 years old father-in-law and the petitioner no. 2 is the husband of the de-facto complainant/alleged victim. The FIR in this case was lodged in 2019. A Charge sheet was

submitted against the petitioners in 2019 itself. Charges were framed in 2022. Yet, till date only one witness has been examined out of a total of twelve witnesses. The petitioner no. 1 stays in Dhanbad and is facing this trial at Barrackpore. Unnecessary adjournments are being allowed.

In the interest of justice, direction may be passed to expedite the proceeding.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits that the State would not come in the way if a direction is passed to expedite the proceeding.

No prejudice will be caused to anyone, if a direction is passed to expedite the proceeding.

It appears that there is delay in conducting the trial, especially in view of the fact that the FIR was lodged in 2019 and the charge sheet was submitted in 2019 itself.

Moreover, the petitioner no. 1 is aged about 90 years and stays in a different State.

Considering such exceptional circumstances, I request the learned trial Court to conclude the trial as expeditiously as possible fixing dates of hearing in short stretches and without granting any unnecessary adjournment to any of the parties, preferably within a period of one year from the next date of hearing.

With these observations and directions, the revisional application is disposed of.

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

(Jay Sengupta, J.)

tbsr/14