

15.12.2025
Court No.25
D/L No.28
S. Gayen

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

WPA 27211 of 2025

**Suman Pramanick
Versus
The State of West Bengal & Ors.**

Ms. Anindita Aaddy (Das)

...for the Petitioner

Mr. Rajarshi Basu
Mr. Shehnaz Tareq Mina

...for the State

1. The grievance of the petitioner in the present writ application is that the petitioner has made a complaint to the Chairperson, Child Welfare Committee, South 24 Parganas, West Bengal but the said committee has not been taken any action on the complaint filed by the petitioner.
2. There is a dispute between the petitioner and his wife with regard to the minor son. The petitioner has filed a guardianship case before the learned District Judge, South 24 Parganas being Case No. 214 of 2024. By an order dated 19th November, 2024, the learned District Judge has passed an ad interim injunction restraining the wife, her men, agents or associates from taking away the minor child namely, Sourav Pramanick beyond the jurisdiction of the learned Court till 19th December, 2024.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that during the existence of the ad interim injunction passed by the learned District Judge, the wife has taken away the child from the jurisdiction of the learned Court. The petitioner has filed an application before the learned Additional District Judge, Fast Track Court and the learned Judge passed an order of visitation rights. Being aggrieved of the said order of visitation, the petitioner has preferred a revisional application before this Court. This Court has dismissed the revisional application. Accordingly, the petitioner has filed a review application and the review application is pending. Now the petitioner has made a complaint before the Child Welfare Committee for taking appropriate action but the Child Welfare Committee has not been taken any action, the petitioner has filed the present writ application.
4. This Court finds that the petitioner has made several allegations against his wife but the wife has not made the party in the present writ application. This Court also finds that the petitioner has already initiated a guardianship case before the learned Court of the District Judge and the learned District Judge initially passed an ad interim injunction restraining the wife for taking away the child from the jurisdiction of the learned Court and subsequently when the Court found that the wife has taken away the child, the learned

Court has passed the visitation rights of the petitioner to see the child.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that now the guardianship case has been transferred from the Court of learned District Judge to the learned Additional District Judge, Fast Track Court, Alipore, South 24 Parganas. She submits that the Additional District Judge, Fast Track Court is not functioning.
6. This petitioner has already taken steps by filing guardianship case which is now pending before the Additional District Judge, Fast Track Court, Alipore. The review application filed by the petitioner is also pending before this Court. Pending the above proceeding, the petitioner has made complaint to the Child Welfare Committee against the wife on the allegation that wife is causing torture upon two minor sons.
7. Considering the above, this Court finds that no relief can be granted to the petitioner in the present writ application. Accordingly, WPA 27211 of 2025 is dismissed. However, dismissal of the writ petition will not prevent the petitioner for taking appropriate steps in the guardianship case pending before the learned Additional District Judge, Fast Track Court, Alipore in accordance with law.

8. As the petitioner has made several allegations in the writ petition against the respondents but this Court has dismissed the writ application at the motion stage without calling for the affidavit, the allegations made by the petitioner are deemed to have been denied.
9. All parties shall act on the server copy of this order duly downloaded from the official website of this Court.
10. Urgent Photostat certified copy, if applied for, be given to the parties upon compliance with all formalities.

(Krishna Rao, J.)