

22 **24.10**
sg **2025**

Ct. No.
22

C.R.R. 3663 of 2017

Sandip Manna
Vs.
The State of West Bengal

1. When the instant Revisional Application was called on for hearing, the records reflect that neither the Petitioner nor any Learned Counsel representing him was in attendance, nor was any prayer for accommodation moved before this Bench.
2. The Court must observe that this matter, having originated in 2017, has languished on the file of this Court for an unconscionable period. Such failure to appear, coupled with the evident procedural laxity that has prolonged this litigation, constitutes a dereliction of the duty owed by the parties to ensure the timely prosecution of their own cause. This unacceptable level of protraction severely strains the Court's resources and frustrates the fundamental mandate of swift justice.
3. Given the egregious age of the matter and the parties' failure to pursue the cause with requisite diligence, this Court finds it to be a judicial imperative that the case be brought to a final conclusion forthwith. To allow such proceedings to linger indefinitely would be to disregard the governing principle that *interest reipublicae ut sit finis litium* (it is in the public interest that there be an end to litigation).
4. Accordingly, and notwithstanding the wilful non-appearance, this matter is taken up for summary disposal based exclusively upon the materials available on the record to

ensure that the ends of justice, particularly the necessity of finality, are subserved.

5. The Petitioner, Sandip Manna, had moved this Court under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. seeking the quashing of proceedings in Case No. S/904 of 2017, initiated under Section 144(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, before the Learned Executive Magistrate, Chandernagore. The challenge was directed against the initiation of the proceeding and subsequent orders, including those dated 14th September, 2017, 18th October, 2017, and 1st November, 2017, which primarily involved maintaining a *status quo* on a disputed property concerning a Durga Puja Pandal.
6. The critical legal determinant in this case is the statutory life of the impugned orders. It is a well-established provision that the force of any prohibitory or directory order passed under Section 144 of the Cr.P.C. expires automatically upon the efflux of two months from the date of its making, unless extended by the State Government, which is not pleaded herein.
7. Since the latest challenged order was passed on 1st November, 2017, its statutory validity elapsed in January 2018. The underlying cause of action concerning the temporary orders has, therefore, ceased to exist.
8. In view of the statutory limitation and the intervening passage of time, the entire proceedings which the Petitioner sought to quash have lost their legal efficacy.
9. Consequently, the instant Revisional Application, being CRR

3663 of 2017, has become entirely infructuous and is hereby dismissed.

10. The interim order, if any, passed by this Court in connection with this Revisional Application stands automatically vacated.
11. Urgent photostat certified copy of this Order, if applied for, be supplied to the parties subject to compliance with all requisite legal formalities.

(Uday Kumar, J.)

