

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA
Criminal Revisional Jurisdiction

Before:

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jay Sengupta

CRR 3900 of 2025
CRAN 1 of 2025

M/s. Safeway Insurance TPA Pvt. Ltd.
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Ors.

For the Petitioner	:	Ms. Sucharita Paul, Mr. Arka Ranjan Bhattacharya.
For the State	:	Mr. Debashish Roy Id.PP., Mr. Koushik Kundu, Mr. Parvej Anam.
For the OP No.2	:	Mr. Rajesh Singh, Mr. Shibashis Nandy.
Heard on	:	19.09.2025
Judgement on	:	19.09.2025

Jay Sengupta, J. :

1. This is an application praying for quashing of a proceeding in GR Case No.2223 of 2025 pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Barasat, North 24 Parganas arising out of Baguiati Police Station Case No.381 dated 16.06.2025.
2. Supplementary affidavit, as filed on behalf of the petitioner, is taken on record.

3. Copies have been supplied to the other side.
4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that during pendency of the proceeding, a settlement and compromise has been arrived at between the private parties and as such, the impugned proceeding ought to be quashed on the ground of settlement.
5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the de facto complainant/opposite party supports such contention of the petitioner. He submits that the dispute between the Insurance Company and a Third Party Administrator have been finally settled and compromised. Therefore, the impugned proceeding ought to be quashed on the ground of settlement.
6. Learned Counsel appearing on behalf of the State relies on the case diary and submits that if a settlement and compromise is arrived at between the private parties, the State would not come in the way. A subsequent statement of the de facto complainant has been recorded by the Investigating Officer. According to such statement, the de facto complainant did not want to proceed with the matter in view of the above-referred settlement. Upon instruction from the Investigation Officer, it is submitted that there is hardly any ingredient made out for the alleged offence of forgery under Section 467 of the Code.
7. It appears that a settlement and compromise has indeed been arrived at between the private parties of all disputes that had led to the initiation of the impugned proceeding.
8. In view of the above, the impugned proceeding is quashed on the ground of compromise and settlement.

9. The revisional application and the application being CRAN 1 of 2025 are, accordingly, disposed of.
10. Urgent photostat certified copy of this order may be supplied to the parties expeditiously, if applied for.

(Jay Sengupta, J.)

Sl. 04/NB