

Dd 20 15.09.2025

MAT/1200/2025
SANJOY BHATTACHARYYA
VS
THE STATE OF WEST BENGAL AND ORS.
IA NO: CAN/1/2025

Mr. Sanjoy Bhattacharyya,
... .. Appellant in person

Mr. Suman Ghosh, Advocate
Mr. Siddhartha Ghosh, advocates
... ..For the State

Mr. Subrata Bhattacharyya, Advocates
.. ...For the respondent Nos. 5-7

1. Appeal is directed against an order dated May 6, 2025 passed in WPA 9029 of 2025.
2. Appellant appears in person.
3. We called for a report from the jurisdictional Superintendent of Police by our order dated September 9, 2025.
4. State and the private respondent nos.5 to 7 are represented.
5. State submitted a report which be taken on record.
6. Learned advocate appearing for the State submits that, pursuant to order dated September 9, 2025, jurisdictional Superintendent of Police considered the records available with the police. According to the jurisdictional Superintendent of Police, there are 52 complaints lodged by the petitioner.
7. Learned advocate appearing for the State submits that, two complaints were registered as first information report. One complaint against the

petitioner was also registered as a first information report.

8. Learned advocate appearing for the State submits that, jurisdictional Superintendent of Police requires further one week's time to consider all the police complaints made by the petitioner. He submits that, the police complaints are repetitive in nature.
9. Appellants submits that, he did not make 52 police complaints. He lodged 14 police complaints.
10. Attention of the appellant is drawn to the two first information reports, being Memari Police Station Case No. 655 of 2024 dated August 7, 2024 and Memari Police Station Case No. 656 of 2024 dated August 7, 2024. He submits that, one is on the basis of the complaint lodged by him and the other is on the basis of the complaint lodged by aunt in-law.
11. Be that as it may, there are two complaints lodged by the police. There is also a counter police complaint as against the petitioner.
12. So far as the other police complaints are concerned, the appellant before us is not remediless. Appellant can avail of the statutory alternative remedy before the appropriate forum.
13. Court is informed by the State that the Deputy Superintendent of Police personally met the appellant subsequent to the order dated September 9, 2025. This meeting is not denied by the appellant who is appearing in person.
14. In such circumstances, we are not in a position to arrive at a finding that there is inaction on the part of the police.

15. Private parties are at liberty to avail of their remedies before the appropriate forum, in accordance with law.
16. MAT/1200/2025 along with the connected application are **disposed of** without any order as to costs.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

(Md. Shabbar Rashidi, J.)