

**IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
CONSTITUTIONAL WRIT JURISDICTION
APPELLATE SIDE**

Present:

The Hon'ble Justice Debangsu Basak

And

The Hon'ble Justice Md. Shabbar Rashidi

M.A.T. 1619 of 2024

Arunangshu Chakraborty

vs.

The Court in its Own Motion.

With

CAN 1 of 2024

For the Appellant : Mr. Arunangshu Chakraborty (in person)

For the Writ Petitioner : Mr. Piyush Chaturvedi, Sr. Adv.,
Mr. Tarun Kumar Das
Mr. Pratap Kumar Yadav

For the University : Mr. Soumya Majumder, Sr. Adv.,
Mr. Pratik Majumder
Mr. Kinnor Ghosh

Heard & Judgment on : **May 14, 2025**

DEBANGSU BASAK, J.:-

1. Appeal is against an order dated August 9, 2024 by which learned Single Judge was pleased to notice that a resolution of the Bar and deferred hearing of the case.
2. Appellant appears in person.

3. Parties of the proceedings in which contempt rule as against the appellant was issued are represented.
4. Paper Book filed in Court be taken on record. Appellant makes over copies of the Paper Book upon learned advocates for the parties in whose parties of the proceedings in which the contempt rule was issued.
5. Appellant submits that, there are subsequent developments in the matter. According to him, the order dated August 9, 2024 no longer exists in view of the fact that learned Single Judge was pleased to pass a fresh order on April 24, 2025. He points out that order dated August 9, 2024 is without any case number. This error was subsequently sought to be corrected by the learned Single Judge by the order dated April 24, 2025.
6. We find from the records that the order impugned is dated August 9, 2024. The body of the order does not speak of the matter in which such order was passed although just below the date of the order serial no. 2 of the cause list is referred to.
7. Be that as it may, we find that the order itself does not decide any issue inter se between the parties or as against the appellant. Impugned order notices a resolution of the Bar, the personal presence of the appellant in Court and his production of the mobile set. Learned Trial Judge thereafter proceeded to adjourn the matter till August 30, 2024.

8. In view of the fact that the appellant did not suffer any punishment so as to attract the provision of Section 19 of the Contempt of Court's Act, 1971 by the impugned order and in view of the fact that no right of the appellant to decide by the impugned order attracting the provisions of Clause 15 of the Letters Patent Act, 1865, we are not inclined to entertain the present appeal.

9. M.A.T. 1619 of 2024 and the connected application being CAN 1 of 2024 are dismissed without any order as to costs.

(Debangsu Basak, J.)

10. I agree

S.D.

(Md. Shabbar Rashidi, J.)