

JPD-03
Ct No.01
31.07.2025
AK

Calcutta High Court
In The Circuit Bench at Jalpaiguri
Appellate Jurisdiction

MAT 9 of 2024
IA No: CAN 2 of 2024
CAN 3 of 2024
CAN 4 of 2025
CAN 5 of 2025

Sukhendra Nath Banik
Vs
The State of West Bengal and others

Mr. Sukhendra Nath Banik ... appellant in person
Ms. Sunandita Banik
.... representing the appellant.

Mr. Joyjit Chaudhury, Ld. AAG
Mr. Hirak Barman
Ms. Bedashruti Bose
...for the State.

- 1.** The petitioner/appellant, appearing in person with the leave of court along with his daughter, submit that there has been a pogrom against them by all authorities.
- 2.** It is submitted that the said fact is apparent from multiple cases being lodged against the appellant.
- 3.** It is submitted that since the appellant's signature has been forged in several cases, it is evident that there is a clique operating against the appellant.

4. However, on repeated queries, the appellant or his daughter are unable to convince us as to any particular motive why they are being targeted by all authorities, including the courts, the Land Revenue Authorities as well as the police.
5. From the report filed before us, a copy of which was circulated to the appellant, it is evident that sufficient steps are being taken in respect of the investigation regarding the multiple allegations of forgery of the signature of the appellant before various authorities.
6. We also find that this investigation has since been handed over to the CID by the direction of the court.
7. Subsequently, one Sri Sudeep Kumar Pradhan, DDI, Darjeeling DD, CID, West Bengal has been designated as the investigating officer.
8. In paragraph no.4 (and its sub-Clauses) of the report, the various steps taken in connection with such investigation have been clearly stated.
9. The reasons of pendency have also been identified.
10. By the order which has been impugned before this court, the learned Single Judge merely

granted liberty to the appellant to approach the appropriate jurisdictional authorities with their grievance, if any.

- 11.** We are satisfied sufficiently that the CID has been handed over the investigation and is undertaking the same at present.
- 12.** Any observation that we make, sitting within the limited jurisdiction of an intra court appeal, might prejudice the investigation either way.
- 13.** In any event, it is always open to the appellant to approach the appropriate Magistrate or the criminal court in the event there is any grievance regarding the proper conduct of the investigation.
- 14.** Thus, we do not find any illegality as such in the impugned order and/or any further necessity to keep the appeal pending.
- 15.** The substantive purpose of keeping the appeal pending before us was to ascertain whether any steps are being taken in the investigation on the basis of the complaints lodged by the appellant, regarding which we have expressed our satisfaction above, at least insofar as the progress of the investigation till date is concerned.

16. However, we make it clear that the CID shall make all efforts to conclude the investigation and file charge sheet as expeditiously as possible, preferably within two months from date.
17. We make this observation since it is evident that the petitioner and his family, including his daughter, are suffering immeasurably and unnecessarily due to the pendency of the investigation.
18. With the above observations, MAT 9 of 2024 is disposed of without interfering with the impugned order, along with all connected pending applications.
19. There will be no order as to costs.

(Sabyasachi Bhattacharyya, J.)

(Uday Kumar, J.)